16111

THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH

VOLUME XXI FEBRUARY, 1935 NUMBER 1

HOW THE DICTIONARY DETERMINES WHAT PRONUNCIATIONS TO USE*

THOMAS A. KNOTT

G. and C. Merriam Co., Springfield, Massachusetts

I HATE to have anybody say as complimentary a thing about me as that because it gives me a terrific responsibility to live up to. But I am awfully glad to have you informed that primarily I was and I hope to continue to be a teacher. I have met many of the problems that you meet. I have coached debaters in high schools, academies, junior colleges, normal schools, colleges and universities. I have coached class plays. I have coached faculty plays. I have written a book on the elements of Old English. I have helped to write high school books on composition. I have helped to write a Freshman English book on composition. All this is merely by way of informing you that perhaps I have a little more professional standing among you than, shall I say, merely the general editor of a dictionary.

The problems of a General Editor of a dictionary, however, are very different from the problems of one who tried to teach graduate courses a great deal of his life. In writing every book that I was concerned with before I moved out of the university world into the dictionary world, I had a perfectly objective audience to write the book for. I had an audience that I had taught myself. I knew the age. I knew something about the intellectual and emotional status of the persons for whom I was producing the book, and when I

* Presented at the Eastern Public Speaking Conference, New York City, April, 1933; reported stenographically.

moved over into the dictionary world, I discovered that I no longer had a perfectly clear cut, almost tangible, familiar, single group of persons to prepare material for, but that we ran in our consumers all the way from the eighth grade pupil, who still, as he did when I was in the grade, in many schools has a copy of a large dictionary on a stand up in the front of the room where he can go and look at the pictures when he gets tired of studying algebra, on up to some of the most advanced graduate students I have ever known who were using copies of the larger dictionaries for raw material at least for their dissertations; and beyond that philologists who even go so far as to examine the etymologies of these larger dictionaries for the purpose of writing learned articles for publication in the *Philological Quarterly* and *Modern Philology*.

If you can tell me of a greater spread in audience than that, I should like to have you tell me. Frankly at many times it has had me puzzled as I have never been puzzled before in my life.

Then, of course, we have to answer questions in many different fields besides those in which I have been primarily interested. We make an endeavor to furnish an elementary graduate student, for example, with material by means of which he may comprehend Chaucer and Shakespeare. We make an effort to explain all of the, as we call them, 166 special departments of human knowledge running all the way from locks and keys and other builders' hardware up to the highest branches of Einsteinian physics and Riemannian mathematics. And again, although of course we have the assistance of 166 highly trained teachers and specialists in all of these various fields of human activity, technical and scientific, we have the job of directing a complex and assimilated output of human information, such I suppose as is matched nowhere else in the human world except perhaps in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* and *Larousse* and Myers's German *Lexicon*.

Not only that, but we are obliged also to meet thousands and thousands of questions about etymology. We are obliged to meet the critical eye of those who have been interested in the development of the senses of words in phonetics and who have had available all of the information about phonetics in the Oxford dictionary. Among all the other subjects that we are obliged to cover exhaustively and as accurately as possible is the problem of pronunciation [prənʌn′ʃi:eɪʃn].

You notice that I still pronounce that in what we give as the second pronunciation of the word. Our preferred pronunciation is

[prənʌnsɪ′eɪʃn] but I am still enough of a research man and college professor to erect my backbone and fly counter to the authority of the book over which I have some influence. And because I was once in the army I continue to say *route* [rɑʊt] and not [ru:t], much to the dismay of our pronunciation editor, who I understand is some day faced with the necessity of removing from our book the implication that the pronunciation route [rɑʊt] is a little below the level of the angels.

Our problem is very greatly multiplied by reason of our title, which is, *Webster's New International Dictionary*. We sell very considerable numbers of dictionaries in Australia, in South Africa, in Canada, quite a few in such almost non-English speaking countries as India and even Japan and China. We sell dictionaries in Scotland. We sell dictionaries in Oxford. We sell dictionaries in London. We sell a good many dictionaries even yet in the United States of America. You can see, therefore, that our method, our decisions that we must reach before we can give the public an interpretation of the evidence, are decisions of entirely different scope from such decisions as were reached by the Oxford Dictionary and such decisions as are still being reached and modified by Daniel Jones.

The *Oxford Dictionary* could quite flatly adopt whatever pronunciation of a word a Scottish schoolmaster named James A. H. Murray believed Oxford professors used, and Daniel Jones in his phonetic dictionary has quite flatly adopted for what he calls his received standard, that type of pronunciation which is used by the general group of educated Englishmen who have attended what they call in England the great public schools, and what we should call the great private preparatory schools.

Mr. Murray, later Sir James—they acknowledged the existence of dictionary editors politically in Great Britain. In this country they are obscure persons, working more or less anonymously on the top floor of a huge stone, jail-like building in—I won't say an inconspicuous New England city, but a New England city through which most people merely pass on their way from Albany to Boston. Sir James Murray had, as I say, a relatively easy task when he was in doubt about the pronunciation of a word. He asked two or three of the Fellows of colleges in Oxford how they pronounced it and then he wrote it down the way he thought they probably ought to pronounce it.

We are faced, you see, on the contrary with a consulting public, which ranges from London to Sydney, to, well, we will say Atlanta and

Chicago and New York City and Boston, and I need to mention only those four cities in the United States to enable you partly to envisage how badly, to speak in colloquial English, we must occasionally be stumped in trying to decide the principles governing the standard pronunciation of the English language even in the United States; because all of you are perfectly aware of the very real, actual spoken differences between the speech of Chicago and the speech of Boston and the speech of New York City and the speech of Atlanta.

As I said a minute ago, Daniel Jones could autocratically say that he was choosing for his received standard, the prevailing rather colloquial speech of a very narrow social and economic group in a very small country. I don't know how many of you realize it but the whole of England has in it, as I recall the figures roughly, approximately as many square miles as the State of Illinois. And there are as I recall it about 48,000,000 people in that very small area. It is also relatively easy to segregate the social class. It is also easy for Mr. Jones to adopt as his standard the ordinary, almost colloquial spoken form of that language. You can, if you know how to read the international phonetic alphabet, take a sentence of fifteen or twenty words and above each word you can represent the pronunciation of the public-school class in England, in Mr. Jones's representation of the international phonetic alphabet, and then, if you have heard enough graduates of the great English public schools sing their language, you can, singing Mr. Jones's notation reproduce a sentence which, shall I say, could almost be understood by some of the members of that social class.

To begin with, it is impossible for a great modern dictionary to represent ordinary speech—I mean a general commercial dictionary which presents pronunciation as one of the many, many kinds of information about which the consulting public asks it. It is impossible for us to take the ordinary running colloquial connected speech. We are obliged by the nature of the case to present in our entries and in the parenthetical pronunciations which follow those entries, only one word at a time. We are also obliged by the nature of the medium in which we work and by the nature of the questions asked us, to present that word not in the ordinary running colloquial script, but as more or less I am delivering my speech now, as what we call in the office and in the conferences of our editorial board, platform speech. We are obliged to present one word at a time. We are obliged to present it as a person would like to know how to pronounce it clearly and unmistakably and familiarly on a public platform.

That is, our book is in its pronunciations more or less a manual of information about platform delivery. You notice I say "platform," I don't say "stage." We are not primarily a manual for stage speech. I don't know what standard you would adopt if you were conducting, we will say, a dramatic school for persons of some considerable talent who wish to become professional actors and actresses. I should imagine that what you ought to do is primarily to go to London, after having received very adequate phonetic and linguistic training, and listen to all of the best actors and actresses you could listen to. You ought to write down on the spot as many hundreds of representative words as you can in an exact phonetic transcription. You ought to practise it. You ought to hire for yourself a competent dramatic teacher with professional experience on the London stage to listen to you while you tried to imitate those British actors and actresses, and to criticize you as violently as you criticize some of your students who wish to become more or less professional speakers, and then you ought to come back and try to teach your students how to speak stage speech.

Stage speech is not Daniel Jones's speech, and stage speech is not the speech of King George V of England. Stage speech is not platform speech. It is not political speech. It is not general public speech.

I regard stage speech, therefore, as a very highly and narrowly specialized type of speech, and whether the stage is in Australia or London or New York, there is without the slightest question a perfectly objective type of pronunciation to which all well trained and thoroughly experienced professional actors and actresses try as hard as they can to conform. What I am talking now is the kind of speech in which we will imagine you might want to train a college student who is a member of the debating team of the State University of Illinois. You don't want to teach him London stage speech. His audiences would laugh. Some of them wouldn't even understand what he was trying to talk about.

Later on when that man becomes, we will say, a political speaker or a lawyer or a minister, if he went into the farming community in the upper Mississippi Valley and spoke as the professional actors speak on the London stage, he might get through one trial sermon in most of the communities I know anything about, but he wouldn't get very much further.

On the other hand, if you are training an ordinary freshman in college anywhere in the United States your problem is to return

that student to his community with those characteristics of an educated person which will make him regarded as an effective person in his community. If you seize upon a student from, we will say, Red Wing, Minnesota, and return him to Red Wing, Minnesota, talking like a native of Cambridge, Massachusetts, I should say offhand that you probably have done him an irreparable harm.

You may agree with me or you may not. I am accustomed to having most of my students disagree with me anyway. That is all right. Go ahead and disagree with me if you want. I am just telling you what my own personal judgment is. The problems of the teacher of speech and the problems of the dictionaries are to provide effective human beings in their communities.

Now, you may ask *what standard we adopt*. You may ask some very much more searching and pertinent questions if we say, as we do professionally, that *just as well as we can we try to represent the platform speech of well educated effective public speakers in the United States of America*. You may ask me whether I pick a public speaker from Boston or from New York City or from Chicago or from Atlanta. Now there is where the pronunciation department of a great general dictionary which cannot produce special local editions for different parts of the English speaking world is faced by what I frankly admit is an unsolvable dilemma.

It is impossible for us to take a perfectly well educated public speaker in the United States of America who has a kind of speech or a kind of pronunciation which exactly meets the social demands of all the communities of the United States. Once in a while you may get a student who can learn four or five kinds of speech, who can go to Cambridge, Massachusetts, and talk to the natives there and have them all congratulate him on his good local type of speech, and who can then go to Chicago and talk to the natives there in their type of speech, and have them all fail to recognize where he spent his childhood and youth. And he may even be able to go to Atlanta and talk with the genuine Southern drawl, and without any r's except wherever the local speakers put them. But I have never seen such a student, and I have had students from all parts of the United States and Canada and even from Great Britain.

I have had students who could learn how to use another type of speech, other than their native type, the type that they learned as children and use. But I never have met that paragon. You are faced and we are faced with an unsolvable dilemma unless you restrict your students to a very narrow geographical area.

I am sorry to say that in some ways that narrowness of the geographical area in many of our universities is becoming stricter and stricter. My own idea is that the student community in every college and university ought to be, at least as far as the United States is concerned, just as cosmopolitan as possible, not merely because that would tend to do something with which I personally and Mr. Carhart personally and the dictionary sympathize, levelling out the differences between the regional types of speech, but because of the very much greater social consequences of having young people together in one community for four years, having them then go back to all parts of the world, the English speaking world, at least, and the non-English speaking world, with some sort of social homogeneity. . . .

Our problem having thus been solved as to which type of American pronunciation we shall adopt, the problems become very much more multitudinous and very much more concrete. We are faced with such questions that are quite extrinsic to any of our interests, questions as to how to pronounce the name of some city. In some part of the United States should it be Albuquerque [ɔlbjuˈkɜ̃:kɪ], or should it be [ˈælbukɜ̃rk]?

We had a very vehement letter of protest just this past week from a college teacher of pronounced linguistic interests, who has been spending some of his recent years in that city, and who wrote us denouncing the pronunciation that we give in our gazetteer. He said that all the educated persons down there pronounced it the other way, whichever way that was. So we went back to our files—I will show you now how we chase these things down to their own localities. We went back to the files to find out where we had obtained our information about the correct pronunciation of the word which I pronounce [ɔlbjuˈkɜ̃:kɪ].

We had four personal letters from the following kinds of people who had spent a large part of their lives in that city: We had a letter from the editor of the principal newspaper in which he said, "All educated persons in this community pronounce the name of this city [ɔlbjuˈkɜ̃:kɪ]."

We had a letter from the superintendent of schools. Of course superintendents of schools are a little bit more migratory than newspaper editors, but they ought to be well educated. They ought to be observant as to the speech, and they ought to be politely sensitive enough to learn how to pronounce the name of the city where they are superintendents of schools. We had a letter from the super-

intendent of schools who said that all educated persons in Albuquerque called it [ɔlbju'kɜ̃:kɪ].

We had a letter from somebody else—I have forgotten whom—and we had a fourth letter from the president of the state university who said that he had been president of the university for a great many years and he had never heard an educated person pronounce it any other way than [ælbu'kɪərkeɪ]. The vote was three to one in favor of [ɔlbju'kɜ̃:kɪ] as I recall it, and so probably with a good deal of human feeling such as some of us have occasionally indulged in in private, they took great pleasure, the pronunciation department of the dictionary, for once in their life over-ruling the president of a university.

We habitually and periodically send around questionnaires containing a very carefully selected list of words with as many as sometimes six different known pronunciations, to just as many people as we dare, people of very widely different classes as far as public speaking is concerned. We include a limited number of college and university presidents. We include a limited number of linguists and phoneticians. We include as large a number usually as we dare of teachers, heads of departments of speech. We include a considerable number of heads of departments of English. In order to prevent conflict we ordinarily try not to select a head of the department of speech from the same institution as that where we select the head of the department of English.

We select some lawyers. We select some of the principal public speakers down in Washington and from various parts of the country. We present them with just as many known pronunciations of these representative words we have a decent record of, and ask them which one of those pronunciations is the one that they prefer. Normally we find that there is a strange prevailing drift in some one direction if we give them as many as even six pronunciations. Out of 300 answers it will run about 125 in favor of No. 1 or 6 or 3, or whatever the one may be, because we always juggle these things around. We try very hard never to put what we think is the prevailing type as the first in the list. We do it once out of five times. That is on the principle of the ballot of some states where the names are arranged alphabetically, but they are rotated for different wards and different political divisions of the city, so there won't be any element of luck. We don't want people to check the first one just because it is the first.

As I say we find about 125 out of 300 say that there is some

one type that they use prevailingly. Another hundred habitually use or hear type No. 2, and the other seventy-five usually are sprinkled out like among the other four candidates, we will say, like votes for the parties outside of the Democratic party in Georgia. They just string out to ten or fifteen for each form.

I have exceeded my time by six minutes. I intended to discuss with you as briefly as possible why we deem it yet inadvisable to employ the International phonetic alphabet instead of what I know Miles Hanley contemptuously refers to as the children's alphabet or the kindergarten alphabet.

One of the reasons it is very hard for us to use the International phonetic alphabet, of course, is that hardly anybody knows it yet. I know you know it. I know it. I can write practically anything in it, and I hope that a great many of my former students can write anything in it and can read anything in it, but take it out to the first twenty-five public school teachers that you meet in an ordinary city public school system, and if there is one of them who has ever heard of it out of twenty-five I should certainly be very, very greatly surprised.

There is the practical, and from our point of view, the highly commercial desirability of continuing for the present, to utilize the alphabet that we have used for seventy-five years as it now stands for this reason.

There are now a great many thousands of elementary school books which use the Webster pronunciation alphabet. There are scores of publishing houses which use it in elementary books and some books that are a little more advanced than just elementary, and whenever the time comes that you people and the phoneticians have taught enough public school teachers, and I may say school superintendents, what the International phonetic alphabet is, we shall be faced as a business concern with wails of anguish from at least twenty publishing houses that we are abandoning.

That is a very practical reason, and those of you who are theoretical—and until I had this present job I was just the same as the rest of you—will probably sniff at that with a certain amount of vigor. From your point of view it is all right, but from ours it is an important argument.

Then we have the further difficulty of representing Mr. Jones's pronunciation, the pronunciation of Australia. If any of you have ever heard an Australian speak, you will know what I mean. The pronunciation of Canada, Atlanta, Chicago and Boston—if you can

tell me how we could represent in the case of some thousands of words as our public demands it, the pronunciation of words that run into six, eight, or ten different types of pronunciation, I should be very grateful if you can tell me how to solve that problem. If you can, I can promise you that the golden day will dawn sooner than I hoped at present for a great commercial dictionary to adopt the International phonetic alphabet.

I would like to say just a word if I may infringe on your time for perhaps two minutes longer, a word about your function in connection with the dictionary.

After all, the dictionary cannot go into the class room and correct speech. We can answer questions if a human being knows the alphabet, and I am sorry to say there are now in our public schools some hundreds of thousands of persons who have never learned the alphabet. I see in the City Library in Springfield the librarians taking them over to the catalogue and teaching them how to find an entry. We probably get five letters every week from school teachers that tell us such and such a word is not in the dictionary and why isn't it. Now, we write back and say, "It is on page 1041, column 2, 8 lines from the bottom."

They don't know the alphabet. If you know how to use the alphabet you can go to a dictionary and find out how to pronounce a word, but no dictionary will ever take you by the ear and tell you that you must not say "dir-i'-ji-b'l" [dɪ'rɪdʒəbl]. You must say dir'-i-ji-b'l ['dɪrɪdʒəbl], accent on the first, not the second.

Here are the cold, black facts in a great book of reference which has from the beginning used the utmost care to represent the prevailing type of pronunciation. Here it is. You are the human beings who must interpret those black marks to our social body.

THE *RHETORIC* OF ARISTOTLE*

LANE COOPER
Cornell University

IT IS a pleasure to be here, to see so many friends, and others who, as I hope, will be friendly when this address is over. According to ancient rule, I fancy, and surely according to modern democratic example, a speaker can afford to be more personal in his

* Presented at the Eastern Public Speaking Conference, Atlantic City, April, 1934.

remarks when he is invited to speak to an audience because it would contain more than a sprinkling of his former pupils and some well-nigh lifelong friends. And I am going to talk about a lifelong friend of mine who is a friend of yours well-known to most of you, a friend to all of us whether we all realize it or some do not. This friend to all writers and speakers, and all teachers of speech and writing, is Aristotle, author of an *Art of Poetry* and a *Rhetoric* which have had a deal of influence throughout the ages; so much influence, in fact, that every student of discourse is sure to be a debtor to these treatises of Aristotle whether the student is aware of it or never has read either of the works. No one can be a reader of books, and not read some one who has profited by reading Aristotle. Accordingly, his influence is pervasive.

Again, no one is likely to advance beyond the point which Aristotle reached in studying the arts of poetry and eloquence unless he has gone with Aristotle as far as the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* will take him. Of course, we may as well admit at once, and once for all, that there are spiritual realms where Aristotle is not comfortable at home; where Plato, for example, is more at home; and yet higher realms, since the birth of Christianity, where pagans generally are not at home and comfortable. And one may say, of course, that Aristotle's theory does not fully explain the pagan art of Aeschylus or Sophocles, or the eloquence of Plato. That is true. No theory of art ever fully accounted for any work that is but partly the result of art and partly results from inspiration. But Aristotle on the arts of poetry and eloquence comes nearer to explaining ancient tragedy and Attic eloquence than to accounting for the Bible, the Greek and Latin hymns of the Church, and the *Commedia* of Dante. Even with respect to these, however, to Dante, for example, nobody is likely to go far in studying eloquence and structure if he is unwilling to see how far the ancient Greek will carry us. And Dante knew that. If I am not mistaken, the most important commentary on *Inferno, Purgatorio,* and *Paradiso* that is now in preparation is the one Mr. W. S. Howell has in hand. This commentary is a systematic research into Dante's theory of eloquence and his practice of the Aristotelian rhetoric. Mr. Howell's unpublished work has helped me more, and helped my students more, than any other recent thing on Dante. And it shows that Dante used the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle, consciously, with great effect. In a capital instance it shows that no other inquiries into the nature of composition are so practically helpful, so useful when you directly apply them to a literary masterpiece. At all events, that is

our considered judgment with respect to Dante's masterpiece. For Dante, Aristotle is in Limbo, without suffering, but without hope; but even in the *Paradiso*, which incidentally is much indebted to Aristotle's treatise *On the Heavens*, even in a realm of Christian poetry where the spirit of Aristotle would not find itself at home, in comfort, and where modern pagans find themselves, to say the least, uneasy, there the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle is the surest guide to Dante's method and aim in constructing the speeches of the persons he represents. And so we must go on saying, until some one else believes us, that while Aristotle probably did not give the final utterance on poetic art and spoken prose, and no one ever will succeed in giving it, nevertheless the individual student is not likely to come nearer to that final utterance than Aristotle did unless he patiently goes with Aristotle as far as Aristotle will guide him. If the student goes as far as that, he will have nothing to unlearn, and will have a head full of real knowledge about literary art. One fine quality in Aristotle is his excellent perspective, so that those who go to school to him become less likely to mistake the trivial for the important. Another is his wonderful fertility in germinal thoughts. The number of interesting remarks on human nature in the *Rhetoric* is amazing. Take the one, for instance, on the reason why the ordinary person in his ordinary mood—I am not quoting—is not afraid of death. Or turn to the *Poetics*. Ross, editor of the great Oxford translation of Aristotle's works, has not in his time been mainly interested in the side of Aristotle's thought to which the *Poetics* belongs, and hence may count for an impartial witness; and it is Ross who thinks that it contains "a greater number of pregnant ideas on art than any other book."

It is easy to see that my friends and I, a considerable element in the gathering of people here, are enthusiastic about Aristotle, though not enthusiastic without measure or reason. Some of them probably used to think me highly enthusiastic about the *Poetics*, at a time when I knew far too little about the *Rhetoric* to understand the *Poetics* as fully as one ought. And some may now consider me lukewarm about the *Rhetoric* since I have, quite recently, turned to Plato, and have been translating his dialogue *Phaedrus*; I am trying to do for it and possibly other things of Plato what was done for Aristotle in the version of the *Rhetoric*, which Messrs. Appleton were good enough to publish. But, in the history of my friends and me, the work on Plato is all one with that on Aristotle, save for this, a point which may be brought out in a species of confession. The point is men-

tioned, not because the story is of something that happened to one person, but because many persons, among them persons in this audience, must have had the like experience. Further, I may dwell upon the following bit of personal history because it should promote my special aim for today. That aim is to make those who have read the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle read it more, along with the *Phaedrus* of Plato, and to make those who are not yet friendly with it as friendly as may be.

Well then, the bit of personal experience is this. When I somewhat unexpectedly took up the teaching of English, as they call it, over thirty years ago, I found experimentally that young people could be thoroughly interested in the better novels like Scott's *Bride of Lammermoor*, or George Eliot's *Romola*, or Hawthorne's shorter stories of New England, along with Homer's *Odyssey*, if the teacher helped himself and his pupils with concepts that may be discovered in the works of Aristotle, but at the time I did not know enough about the *Rhetoric*. I found that our Freshmen could examine any first-rate specimen of imaginative fiction to advantage when you introduced those Freshmen to the principles of imaginative structure that one may read in Aristotle's work on poetry, if you didn't lay undue stress on the source from which the principles were drawn. There are still some people, since the time of Bruno and Francis Bacon, who do not like the name of Aristotle; and traditional scholarly prejudices somehow find their way into the undergraduate mind. At all events, you could dodge the prejudice by letting the ideas of Aristotle pass for any one's ideas, even your own. Being principles, not rules, they worked quite well irrespective of their source. When tested by examples they seemed to have validity, made the Freshmen think their instructor more original than he was, and, what is very important, gave the pupil faith in his teacher, and *vice versa*. The source, however, could not long be hid. Very soon, and very often, the truth about the source came out, and a strange matter began to be talked of. There was a teacher, and there were students, before long actually graduate students, who believed that Aristotle's *Art of Poetry* was something more than a mere historical document to be looked at with a cooler eye than an entomologist turns upon a bug. The honest entomologist, I fancy, does not think himself superior to the bug or other work of nature he is studying. But you know there are a good many persons who think themselves superior to Aristotle, and if they are right it is a hopeful sign in our times, for long and careful study has convinced me that Aristotle, while altogether

human, and not incapable of mistakes, was a very intelligent person, with the uncanny habit of being right at least nine times out of ten. He is above all right where the study of human relations is concerned, for this is a study in which the Greeks from Homer down to Aristotle and Menander excelled the department of noble name at Yale. Because Aristotle is, so to speak, invariably right in studying human relations, the loving scholarship which the Italian and Frerch Renaissance lavished upon his *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* was just, while the envy of Giordano Bruno and of Francis Bacon provides the model which our day must undertake not to follow. Read Bacon's envious notes on the *Rhetoric*, and blush at his ingratitude when he was so heavily indebted to this work, the ingratitude of Bacon, that head without a heart.

But let us be more precise in our confession. My error with regard to the *Poetics* and the *Rhetoric* lay where any one can guard against it, once it is pointed out. The error lay in sometimes paying more attention to a commentary than I paid to the work on which the comments have been written. Let us keep calling it an error rather than a fault. Students of a modern literature who feel the need of learning about Greek ideas, about the background of culture that endures, necessarily go to the books on ancient history and literature that pass for reputable scholarly helps. Such a reputable book is the one I am about to mention, and I have no doubt that with regard to it the views of some of you have undergone the change that mine have undergone, while perhaps some of you continue to think as well of it is I once did. It is the well-known work called *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, by the late Samuel Henry Butcher. For many years it has held the field as, for our time, the standard commentary on the *Poetics* of Aristotle to be had in English. Even among classical scholars outside the circle of those who specialize in the study of Aristotle, the far superior work of Bywater has not made the right headway against Butcher. Let us add that the volume of Butcher remains a stimulating book. For myself, I still refer my classes to it, but every year now wtih increasing caution. What is wrong with it? Well, for example, Butcher has an essay, his Chapter 8, entitled The Ideal Tragic Hero, supposedly interpreting what Aristotle says of tragic character, and full of lively reference to Shakespeare, Schiller, and Corneille, to ancient and modern tragedy in general. But the word "hero," the Greek word ἥρως, does not occur in Aristotle's *Poetics*; in fact, it does not occur in the singular number throughout Aristotle's extant writings; and the emphasis Butcher

lays upon one agent in an action where several agents are required obscures the real demand of Aristotle with regard to tragic character. What Aristotle says of *ethos* in a tragedy applies to all the agents that engage in the action of a play; and he says specifically that having one [man] for the story does not produce a unity of action. You could have perfect unity of action in the tale of the fifty daughters of Danaus running from wedlock with the fifty sons of King Aegyptus. In various ways, and in the long run, Butcher does not put the emphasis where Aristotle puts it, or where we need it. The Briton is an honorable man, no doubt the soul of honor in his usual relations, who does not realize his own sophistication, and is all unknowingly infected with the modern love of paradox. Aristotle is a subtle, I will not say "slippery" Greek, who on occasion will force a poor example to illustrate a principle that is sound, is absolutely free from the Greek Sophistical tradition, and is untainted by the Sophist's love of paradox.

I shall give one other illustration of false emphasis in Butcher, but take the opportunity first to speak of a most admirable edition of the *Poetics* which has just appeared in Germany, by Alfred Gudeman. Gudeman's text of the *Poetics* and his commentary are far and away the best so far, so good, I think, that they will never really be improved upon unless a new and better manuscript than we now possess for the *Poetics* is discovered in papyrus.

The second point of emphasis I wish to raise concerns the *Rhetoric*. Butcher says of the *Poetics*, quoting Goethe, that "it needs some insight into Aristotle's general philosophy to understand what he says about the drama; that otherwise he confuses our studies." The statements are given in the words of Butcher. The first is true, and would be equally true of any author you please. The more you know about the rest of an author's works, the better you can interpret any one of them. But the implication that in order to read Aristotle's *Poetics* with intelligence you need first to know his *Physics* and *Metaphysics*, for example, is nonsense. The assertion that without a knowledge of his *Physics* or *Metaphysics* the study of his *Poetics* is confusing is absolutely false. The knowing know that the ablest of the British students of this *Art of Poetry* in our time was Bywater, who properly links the *Rhetoric* with the *Poetics*, and says of the latter:

> The book taken as it is, with perhaps an occasional sidelight from some of his other works, is intelligible enough; after a brief introduction he gives us in outline all that he has to say on the subject immediately before him, the

technique of the Drama and the Epic. He tells one in fact how to construct a good play and a good epic, just as in the *Rhetoric* he tells one how to make a good speech. And in doing this he has succeeded in formulating once for all the great first principles of dramatic art, the canons of dramatic logic which even the most adventurous of modern dramatists can only at his peril forget or set at naught.

Fortunately when Bywater's great edition appeared I could recognize the superiority of a master hand to the somewhat amateurish Butcher. My version of the *Poetics* aimed simply to make clear the meaning of it to a Sophomore or Junior student, say, more especially by expanding the curt memoranda of examples in the text and by adding more examples. I trusted Bywater, though not uncritically, and let the text and translation of Butcher alone. His smooth English somehow glides over the Greek, and does not come to grips with it. Yet thanks to him I did once use the word "hero," which Aristotle does not use, thus: "The Unity of a Plot does not consist, as some suppose, in having one man as the hero." I believe that word is the only one I deplore in my amplified version of Aristotle's *Poetics*. And you observe that it is after all not so bad, perhaps good enough, in effect, because of Aristotle's saying "as some suppose." Some still suppose it. The thing I really deplore is this. It is a sin not of commission but of omission. I did not betimes go at the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle as a self-respecting teacher of literature should, and as Aristotle says you should in order to understand the *Poetics*. Butcher says, if you wish to know this book, study Aristotle's philosophy; he nowhere shows the slightest interest in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* as a substantial help with the *Poetics*, or as a help in studying literature. If Butcher had told my generation, "By all means read the *Rhetoric*," we would have read it. Aristotle, we thought, wasn't always right, but Butcher was. How many of this audience in their time have felt that way? Let us give more heed to Aristotle and to those who interpret him as one who is superior to them than we give to the clever critics who think they rise superior to him.

Now, as compared with Butcher, what does Aristotle say? In effect he says: An epic poem or a tragedy is all made up of speeches. A poet therefore must be able to compose a speech, in fact a number of speeches, for each and every kind of person which the plot or action may demand. By extension we could say with Aristotle: the writer of a comedy, as Aristophanes, or of a dialogue, as Plato, or of a novel, as George Eliot, is all the while composing speeches for the characters. That is precisely what the author has to do after he has

made an outline of his plot or structure, and settled on his *dramatis personae*, and sits down with his pencil or his stylus in his hand, and takes up the actual business of composing his drama, or Platonic dialogue, or novel. He has to write just one speech after another. By way of preparation, therefore, let the poet, or the writer of dramatic dialogue in general, study Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. That, in brief, is what Aristotle thinks ought to be done. Because he treats the art of writing speeches, and treats it fully, in this work, therefore Aristotle deals cursorily with this matter in the *Poetics*, where he devotes to it but a few important sentences. These sentences lead directly to the *Rhetoric*, which thus to the student of the *Poetics* becomes, as it were, one great chapter of the latter work, a section bulkier than the *Poetics* as this stands. The advice of Aristotle is correct. If the poet, novelist, writer of short stories, is composing speeches all the time, he ought to study Rhetoric, and Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is a good one. My friends and I believe it is the best. And we have much the same advice for any one who really wishes to see how Dante goes about his task in the *Commedia*.

So for a number of years, and thanks to Butcher, I failed to understand the bearing of the *Rhetoric* as a whole on the *Poetics*. I thought that the part of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* that concerned my students and me was the third book, the one on Diction and Arrangement, but especially his remarks on Diction. And I put Welldon's rendering of the twelve chapters on Diction into a book called *Theories of Style*, a quarter of a century since. Then gradually my own pupils taught me better, Drummond first and chiefly, and later Caplan among others. And finally, as some of the audience know, I was converted, and tried to do an English version of the *Rhetoric* that would help my students of poetics, and would meet the need of public speakers, too. So it comes about that I am here to-day, urging every one who cares for literature not to neglect the *Art of Poetry*, and to read, and keep rereading, Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. Of course I should like to have you read my version. If you don't like that, then read the excellent translation by Rhys Roberts; it is better than any other version that has been made in England. However, Roberts did not specially intend his version for the kind of student we meet in American classes, and I specially did. I tried to keep in mind the kind of student Herrick said he taught in Iowa, that kind I was at Rutgers, the kind of undergraduate I have met in Ithaca, New York, Urbana, Illinois, and elsewhere. I hoped the book would find a use in larger classes than I think have used it, and believe that any one

who tries it there will find, not my translation, but Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, the best book for written composition and as a practical guide to public speakers that ever was put forth.

This belief is not unusual. Others have shared it. A century or more ago, Bishop Copleston said of Aristotle and the *Rhetoric*:

> If ever an author labored more than another, in an age of sophistry and dogmatism, to establish the empire of common sense and reason, it was Aristotle. . . . It is unfortunate for the fame of Aristotle that he should be known chiefly as the author of the Logical Treatises. The Treatise on Rhetoric is a magazine of intellectual riches. Under an arrangement the most accurate perhaps and the most luminous ever marked out, the diversified elements of thought, of feeling, and of taste, are presented in due order to the reader's mind. Nothing is arbitrary, nothing gratuitous. Long experience with mankind, attentive observation of human nature in public and in private life, the political history of past times, and the occurrences of his own age, furnished him with the materials of this great work. In the course of the inquiry, nothing is left untouched on which Rhetoric, in all its branches, has any bearing. His principles are the result of extensive original induction. He sought them, if ever man did seek them, in the living pattern of the human heart. All the recesses and windings of that hidden region he has explored; all its caprices and affections, whatever tends to excite, to ruffle, to amuse, to gratify, or to offend it, have been carefully examined. The reason of these phenomena is demonstrated, the method of creating them is explained. The Third Book contains a body of rules for good writing, traced to those natural principles out of which they all grow, and illustrated by examples which his own intimate acquaintance with the best poets and orators of Greece readily supplied. The whole is a textbook of human feeling; a storehouse of taste; an exemplar of condensed and accurate, but uniformly clear and candid, reasoning.

Voltaire said of the treatise and its author:

> I do not believe there is a single refinement of the art that escaped him. . . . Nothing better proves the great sense and good taste of Aristotle than his having given each thing its place.

The late Rhys Roberts said:

> As in the *Politics*, . . . so here, he takes all due account of previous efforts and experience. . . . His repeated references either to "the present-day writers on rhetoric" generally, or to specified teachers and theorists, are enough to show that he has faithfully reviewed the rhetorical field of his own and previous days. And in the light of current shortcomings he lays down the true philosophical principles of rhetoric, considered as a branch of the science of man, and writes a treatise which has never been superseded, and is never likely to be superseded. The *Rhetoric* has been described as an "isolated" work. Its true distinction is that it does not stand alone without predecessors or successors, but that it stands apart and pre-eminent even where the predecessors and successors are so numerous; it is the most philosophical (or, scientific) work ever produced on the subject.

Ernest Havet said:

> My task is completed if I have made the reader see that this Rhetoric, the oldest of all, nevertheless is the one that has aged the least, the one that to-day remains the most useful, because it is based upon principles higher and more universal than any other.

Cardinal Newman was heavily indebted to the *Rhetoric* in his theory of composition, in his actual writings of the longer sort, and in his sermons. In his *Idea of a University*, having just quoted from the ancient treatise, he thus begins Part 5 of Discourse V:

> Do not suppose that in thus appealing to the ancients I am throwing back the world two thousand years, and fettering philosophy with the reasonings of paganism. While the world lasts will Aristotle's doctrine on these matters last, for he is the oracle of nature and of truth. While we are men, we cannot help, to a great extent, being Aristotelians, for the great Master does but analyze the thoughts, feelings, views, and opinions of human kind. He has told us the meaning of our own words and ideas, before we were born. In many subject-matters, to think correctly is to think like Aristotle; and we are his disciples whether we will or no, though we may not know it.

Finally, let us attend to what the best-known schoolmaster of recent times, Arnold of Rugby, had to say of his school and of his hopeful Matthew who was about to leave it:

> We have been reading some of the *Rhetoric* in the Sixth Form this half-year, and its immense value struck me again so forcibly that I could not consent to send my son to a University where he would lose it altogether.[1]

CAN WE REDEFINE THE JAMES-WINANS THEORY OF PERSUASION?

WILLIAM NORWOOD BRIGANCE
Wabash College

THE old definitions of persuasion labelled it as an act to "induce or win," "to draw the will of another," or "to bring the will . . . to a desired decision." Blair defined it as that which "affects . . . the will and practice." Whately defined it as "the art of influencing the *Will*." But these are mere descriptive words. They tell us what persuasion does, namely, that it influences the "will," but

[1] Apart from the quotation from Cardinal Newman, the source of which is indicated above, these passages which have just been cited, beginning with that from Copleston, can be most easily found in my translation, *The Rhetoric of Aristotle*, New York, 1932, pp.xi-xiii.

they tell us nothing of the processes which induce it or the means of attaining it.

More than twenty years ago Professor Winans attacked this problem. He went back to the fundamental psychology of William James, that "What holds attention determines action," that "what checks our impulses is the mere thinking of reasons to the contrary." [1] Premising his foundation principle of persuasion on this concept of James, Professor Winans defined persuasion as "The process of inducing others to give fair, favorable, or undivided attention to propositions." [2] Having reduced persuasion to this common denominator of attention, Winans proceeded to construct his whole concept of rhetoric upon it so that, after finishing the book, he could justifiably say in the preface, "The key word is Attention."

Thus for the first time in our history, an attempt was made to define the *technique* of persuasion, to give students an insight into its processes, and to rest its premises upon a fundamental psychological foundation. In doing this it seems to me that Professor Winans has made probably the greatest contribution to the field of rhetoric since Quintilian laid down his stylus at the close of that monumental work some 1840 years ago.

Yet I am sure that neither Winans nor James would contend that this definition was the last word on the matter. It may be a risky thing to speak for Professor Winans who is up and about, and so potently able to speak for himself. Yet I believe that I can risk this much: He, as James, would say that he had merely "made progress," had gone as far as the psychological knowledge of that day permitted him to go. There he had left the problem to await further research and discoveries.

I wish to pick up the problem where Winans laid it down, to see if we cannot, in the light of psychological research since the day of William James, gain a better insight into persuasion and redefine it in such a way as to afford a better knowledge of the processes through which persuasian operates.

In doing this I would first call attention to the fact that the psychological research of the past generation has wrought a fundamentally changed concept both of the nature of persuasion and of the nature of attention. Let us look first at persuasion. James and Winans viewed it primarily as a *mental* process, colored of course by

[1] William James, *Psychology, Briefer Course*, (Holt, 1892) 448.
[2] James A. Winans, *Public Speaking*, (Century, 1915) 194.

emotional influences. Winans quotes James to the effect that "*we reach the heart of our inquiry into volition when we ask by what process it is that the thought of any given action comes to prevail stably in the mind.*" [3] Notice the use of those words "volition" and "mind."

The more generally accepted view today, however, is that persuasion takes place, not on an intellectual, but rather on a *motor* level. Some psychologists, as the behaviorists and Gestaltists, deny the existence of any "mind," or "mental life" whatever. Even the more conservative psychologists, while admitting that we may yet awhile keep our "minds," nevertheless insist with Woodworth that "this 'tripartite division' [mind, emotion, and will] is now regarded as rather useless, if not misleading." [4] According to both viewpoints, persuasion takes place on a motor level and involves an interplay of the conscious and unconscious, mental and muscular. Such a concept of persuasion makes it difficult to define in terms wholly of attention.

At the same time that the concept of persuasion has been changing, that of attention has likewise been changing. Behaviorists and Gestaltists, of course, claim that attention is a term outworn and unneeded. Watson says we don't "need the term." [5] Köhler scorns it as "so-called attention." [6] Even such relative conservatives as Woodworth and Troland restrict its function. Woodworth says, "Attention is preparatory . . . in a word, exploratory." [7] But if attention is a mere preparatory or exploratory function, it would be inadequate to explain persuasion. Troland is even more definite. Attention, according to him, is an element of consciousness, but "consciousness, even in its volitional phases, offers only *a very fragmentary* representation of the total mechanism of response." [8] Even Madison Bentley, arch conservative, insists that "whenever attention has retained its magical properties as a director, selector, and guide to the organism it has swept together a mass of material of doubtful character and of uncertain classification." [9]

In short, we must conclude that, while under the concept of these terms as they were used in the day of William James, we could de-

[3] Winans, *op. cit.*, 192.

[4] R. S. Woodworth, *Psychology*, (Holt, 1921), 523.

[5] J. B. Watson, *Behaviorism*, (Norton, 1924) 201.

[6] Wolfgang Kohler, *Gestalt Psychology*, 324.

[7] *Op. cit.*, 523.

[8] L. T. Troland, *The Fundamentals of Human Motivation*, (Van Nostrand, 1928) 266.

[9] Madison Bentley, *The Field of Psychology*, (Appleton, 1924), 177.

fine persuasion in terms of attention, yet today as these terms are used and understood by psychologists, such a definition is insufficient and is to psychologists possibly misleading.

If that be true, can we redefine persuasion—not merely redefine it by using new terms for old—but redefine it in the light of newer research so that we can come closer than before to understanding its nature and its processes? I believe we can.

Our brethren in the field of psychology are by no means a harmonious family in most parts of their realm, but on this one subject they present a striking and happy concord of opinion. They agree that the dominant basis of human belief and action is *desire*. As Mary Follett has said in her splendid book, *Creative Experience*, the nineteenth century talked of the *will* of the people and the early twentieth century talked of the *rights* of man, but "now psychology has given us *desire* as the key word of life. Students of social relations see desire as the basis of all the actions and interactions of men." [10]

As we survey the field, we find indeed that Mary Follett is right. The astute old master, Aristotle, 2300 years ago wrote that, "Reason does not appear to produce movement independently of desire . . . But desire prompts action in violation of reason." [11] William James, two generations ago, recognized that we have a "tendency to believe emotionally exciting objects, that, other things being equal, we believe those things *"which are most interesting, those things which appeal most urgently to our aesthetic, emotional and active needs."* [12] Winans also recognized it, pointing out that "awakening desire for the end sought" was an important means of fixing attention, [i.e. of persuasion.] [13] Both James and Winans, however, evidently regarded desires as an *incident* of persuasion, whereas later research points to it as the *essence*.

Among the older conservative psychologists, Jastrow assures us that "Beliefs are formed and held because they satisfy . . . minister to some deep psychological craving or some simpler need or indulgence. [14] If we turn to the behaviorists, radicals in the field of psy-

[10] Mary Follett, *Creative Experience*, (Longman's Green, 1824) Preface, xiii.

[11] *De Anima* (Hammond trans., Macmillan, 1902), 133.

[12] *Psychology*, (Holt, 1890) II, 307 and 312. To James belief was the basis of conduct.

[13] *Op. cit.*, 196.

[14] J. Jastrow, *Psychology of Conviction*, 5.

chology, we find that E. B. Holt, a pioneer thinker of that school, premises his entire book, *The Freudian Wish*, on the release of desires, or the "wish," as a factor of conduct. Opposite him stands McDougall, who terms behaviorism as a "misshapen dwarf" and pities Holt's particular species of it as the "forlorn banner," yet here McDougall meets Holt on common ground. He insists that, to understand human conduct, we must reckon with the "springs of human action, the impulses and motives that . . . regulate conduct." [15] If we turn to the *Gestaltists*, we find that Raymond Holder Wheeler, its ablest exponent in America, holds to the dynamic view that "no action was ever started that did not move toward a goal set up before that action started," and that even in such lesser persuasive factors as Suggestion "The person acting must *want* to believe." [16]

If we turn to the field of abnormal psychology, we find Morton Prince insisting that emotions, or desires, are the "driving power" of human conduct. [17] If we approach the middle-ground psychologists, Crane tells us that "what is called the Will [i.e. that Will of which persuasion is 'the art of influencing,'] is simply the response to the sum of motives leading the individual to one kind of behavior in contrast to those influencing him in the other direction." [18] Likewise Woodworth bases his entire framework of psychology on this dynamic view and introduces us to "urges" and "drives" in conduct. "So far as it is possible," says he, "for us to influence other people and control their behavior, it is by controlling their desires and purposes." [19]

With refined techniques, psychologists have studied both quantitatively and qualitatively the operation of desires in human conduct. F. H. Lund's studies are particularly impressive. He set up a technique to measure the correlation of belief on the one hand with evidence, knowledge, and desire on the other. His results showed that the correlation between belief and desire was greater than that of any other force known to influence belief. [20]

[15] W. McDougall, *Social Psychology*, (Luce, 1923) 2-3.

[16] To the author, August, 1930.

[17] Morton Prince, *The Unconscious*, (Macmillan, 1914) 369.

[18] George W. Crane, *Psychology Applied*, (Northwestern U. Press, Chicago, 1932) 31.

[19] Chapter on "Dynamic Psychology," in the Clark University, *Psychologies of 1925*, 118.

[20] *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XX (1925), 194-5. Statistically minded persons may be interested in knowing that Lund's correlation between Belief and Evidence was + .42, between Belief and Knowledge was + .64, and between Belief and Desire was + .88.

Industrial psychologists now proceed on the assumption that desire is the determining force in modern economics. Starch, Hollingsworth, Poffenberger, Adams, and others have constructed charts attempting to show the relative strength of human desires, in order that advertisers may more cheaply and effectively reach the consumers. Daniel Starch, for example, on a scale of 10, computed the desire for Health as 9.0, for Safety as 7.8, and for Style as 5.8.[21]

In short, the lines of modern research, to say nothing of common sense, converge to show that desires are the basic determinant of persuasion.

The revised definition of persuasion toward which I have been moving is doubtless already obvious. For convenience of a formal definition, I think that we can state it in these words:

1. Where the aim is to arouse indifference, to inspire, or to stimulate lagging enthusiasms and faiths—

PERSUASION IS A PROCESS OF VITALIZING OLD DESIRES, PURPOSES, OR IDEALS.

2. Where the aim is to secure the acceptance of new beliefs or courses of action—

PERSUASION IS A PROCESS OF SUBSTITUTING NEW DESIRES, PURPOSES, OR IDEALS IN PLACE OF OLD ONES

This, of course, is not a fatalistic doctrine. *Men pursue their wants, interests, desires. But how they pursue them is not fatally determined; for interests and appetites, fears and loves, may be freely attached to all sorts of objects for stimulus and to all kinds of objects for satisfaction. Whether men shall pursue an immediate want or a remote one, whether they shall accept the satisfaction of a high idealistic desire or of a low material one, has always been, and so long as this planet supports human life will continue to be, dependent in part on how vividly and impellingly these alternatives are revealed to them by leaders, thinkers, writers, and speakers.*

Where do reason and argument enter the picture? What part do they play in human behavior? A very impelling part indeed. People to be sure may avoid reasoning as long as there is smooth sailing, for they dislike the strenuous effort which it demands. But when they get in a jam, when they must solve a perplexing problem, or must find a way out, they resort to reason. Reason, in other words, is the instrument for solving our problems, for satisfying our desires, for obtain-

[21] A. T. Poffenberger, *Psychology of Advertising*, (Shaw, 1926) ch. 4.

ing the higher values of life. Argument, of course, is reasoning set forth by speech or printed words. We may not argue a man into a desire, but we can by argument and reason enable ourselves and others to solve our problems and advance toward attaining our desires. A scientist, for example, may want to learn the nature of cosmic rays. His reason for wanting to, when elaborated, can always be reduced to other wants. We might facetiously say that he wants to because he wants to. So he focusses the genius of his intellect, his reasoning powers, upon the study of cosmic rays, i.e. in the effort to satisfy his want. Then, having discovered some new property of this phenomenon, he arranges his proof of it in the form of an argument, so that others who are also interested—that is, who also want to learn of cosmic rays—may have the discovery demonstrated to them in convincing form.

It follows, therefore, that, although argument plays an important part in persuasion, arguments are not equally persuasive simply because they are equally logical. Effective arguments must unite logic with the springs of action in human beings, must premise it upon human beings. In short, to be effective an argument must become logic surcharged. If we happen to be a scientist who desires to know more of the cold facts about cosmic rays, then a cold array of logical facts will to us be impelling because it satisfies our desire. But approach us on a burning educational issue, communism, the New Deal, or the brain trust—and at once a different set of desires are touched upon which must be reckoned with by all who would attempt to persuade us.

Let us follow this theory of persuasion into its *modus operandi* on a simple public issue on which the American government and people have reversed themselves within the past decade, namely the recognition of Soviet Russia. Ten years ago both government and the mass of people steadfastly opposed recognition. The reason, stated officially by the Secretary of State and in the high sounding resolutions of patriotic societies, was that the communistic government of Russia was intent on the overthrow of American capitalism, Constitution, and religion. The average American, of course, dislikes radical changes. He wants to keep capitalism, even though he may have no capital himself. He wants to keep his Constitution, even though he may connive with lawyers (and in that day with bootleggers) to evade it. He wants to keep his religion, even though he may call upon God each Sunday from behind a golf bunker instead of from a church pew. So Main Street hated the Russian Revo-

lution and opposed Russian recognition because it thought they threatened the satisfaction of these desires. Of course there were minor issues, but this was the basic factor.

Between 1923 and 1933, however, three things happened. First, the American people ceased to fear that communism in Russia would upset the established order in America. Second, under stress of extraordinary economic conditions, the average business man began to look with covetous eyes on Russian trade. Third, Japan's Manchurian policy disturbed many far-thinking Americans, especially government officials. This group wanted Russian friendship in order to checkmate Japan's possible menace to American interests in the Far East. So because the threat to one want had subsided, and two new wants had arisen, the American government reversed itself and the American people favored its action; and there sits today in Washington an accredited ambassador of a government whose existence we steadfastly refused to recognize for fifteen years.

Now we might explain this, of course, in terms of having our "will and practice" affected, as would Whately and Blair. But that merely tells *what* happens, and that is already obvious. Or we might explain it, as Winans would, in terms of how the American government and people were led "to give fair, favorable, or undivided attention" to the issue. That certainly is better than Whately or Blair's version, for it explains *how* it happened. But it fails to explain *why* it happened. Not until we explain the process in terms of changing *wants*, have we explained not merely what happened and how it happened, but also *what made it happen*.

The true goal in the study of persuasion, it seems to me, is to explain this headspring of persuasion.

ILLUSION IN THE THEATRE: THE THEORIES OF BAKSHY

ULRIC MOORE
Cornell University

THERE is considerable controversy in the theatre over the aesthetic validity of realistic presentation. At one extreme stand those who believe in naturalism, realism, selective realism; at the other the exponents of expressionism and constructivism; and in between is the more equivocal group employing symbolism, impressionism, formalism, conventionalism. That all of these designations

can be applied at the same time to the same art signifies there are widely varying points of view on the problem of stage illusion or the relation of the audience to the presentation.

Looking at the matter historically it would seem that, while authorities do not always agree on their interpretation of sources,[1] at various times in the past conflicting attitudes toward illusion appear to have existed. The conventions of the Greek stage with its chorus and its masks and *ekkeklema*, the multiple stage of the Middle Ages, the Shakespearean platform stage, the painted perspective of the Renaissance and Restoration, the wing sets of the Victorian era all would seem to show that audiences have been willing to accept much that was inconsistent with realistic portrayal. On the other hand, the time and money lavished on realistic detail in these very same periods testify to an effort to satisfy an apparently contradictory desire to give the spectator the illusion of reality. Yet today, as then, whether a play be presented with completely realistic detail or with the starkness of a constructivistic set, there remains the fact that the producer's purpose is to carry his audience from an everyday world into an imaginary or fictitious one. The nature of this imaginary world and the spectator's relation to it are matters of widely varying opinion, and it is this relation which determines whether or not the spectator is to experience the drama as a work of art, i.e. whether he is to experience the aesthetic emotion.

In looking at a painting one is not asked to "lose oneself" in it, to roam in imagination the scene portrayed, nor in listening to music is one to fancy in its swell the roar of the ocean. Such an illusion may be delightful, but it is not what is termed the "aesthetic experience." While it is difficult to define the aesthetic emotion in unequivocal terms, it would seem to involve a pleasure in the perception of certain relationships presented in the work of art. These relationships may be of line, color, sound vibration, mass, etc., depending upon the medium, but whatever they are, they form a composition or pattern that gives delight to the sense addressed. Moreover, in addition to this purely sensuous effect there exists also an idea or context which gives the spectator a deeper perception of the natural world, which the work of art interprets.

The disciple of realism in composing his art-work turns to the natural world as something to copy, to *represent*, in some arrangement of his own choosing. His realistic creation depends for its

[1] Compare Lee Simonson's *The Stage is Set*, with Sheldon Cheney's *The Theatre*.

effect upon the interest of the story told or the accuracy of observation presented, but its effectiveness is only superficial. The more penetrating perception in which a disregard for actuality may make it possible to state a larger truth is lacking. One of the most striking examples of this difference between literal reproduction and creative perception may be seen in comparing a typical piece of sculpture of fifty years ago with one of the "modern school." In the former the cast might seem to have been molded from the model, but in the latter the model has been the inspiration for a composition that does not reproduce the natural object but that arouses emotions concerning it through the presentation of the material.

In the theatre in addition to the sensuous effort of scenery, costume, movement, etc., there exists the all-important effect of the dramatic conflict involved in human relationships. Here again if the dramatic production be naturalistic, the play is limited to being a copy or representation of actual life beyond the theatre. Such a production demands that the spectator be subject to the illusion that he is somehow viewing something actually existent somewhere else at the moment and that by some magic he is viewing it in the theatre. For the illusion to be complete it also demands that he forget for the moment his own personality, his ego, his awareness of his own reactions, to enter the life on the stage as an invisible participant in its dramatic action.

That such perfect illusion is possible cannot be denied. That it is very difficult to maintain is also undeniable; but that its maintenance is aesthetically desirable is highly controversial. The theatrical producer committed to the pursuit of the perfect illusion chimera finds that a thousand technical details impede him. Every material element used—the scenery, lights, properties, costumes—must bear out this impression of a natural world. His ideal becomes even more elusive as such technically facile mediums as the cinema train succeeding generations to expect greater and greater perfection in realistic detail and as theatre audiences resultantly grow more and more reluctant to accept as realistic, stage conventions that satisfied earlier generations.

The seemingly contradictory willingness of our forefathers to accept realistic crudities while they delighted in realistic detail has been accounted for by the explanation that the technical discrepancies were unconsciously excused on the ground of insurmountability.[2]

[2] Such seems to be the opinion of Lee Simonson in his recent history of stage setting, *The Stage is Set*.

There is, however, another explanation of this earlier tolerance of unrealistic effects. Other eras may have looked upon the theatre not as a *representational* but as a *presentational* medium. Thus, as are other forms of art, drama may have been considered a medium for expressing a larger imaginative truth rather than for slavishly copying a more prosaic factual one. Thus, what we look upon as "realistic crudities" may not have been so considered, as they were not seen as "poor imitations" of real places, but rather as diagrammatical or conventional presentations of the situation and locale.

That this was the attitude of at least the Greek and the Shakespearian audiences is the opinion of Alexander Bakshy,[3] Russian critic of the English and American stage.

He sees the prologue to *Pyramus and Thisbe*, from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* as "a satire, not on the conventional methods as such, but on the stupidity of simpletons among the actors and authors, as well as among the audience" who felt that the actor should try to be the person he portrayed, who forgot that what they saw on the stage was an actor. "Shakespeare failed to foresee Drury Lane of today [i.e. the realistic type of presentation] when, through the mouth of Bottom, he made fun of the playgoers who were apt to see the real beast in the actor wearing a lion's skin." Bakshy goes on to say that the modern playgoer, accustomed to elaborate representation of the scene of action, finds it almost incredible that people could be satisfied with such "crude" methods. The usual explanation is that people then were endowed with an extraordinary power of imagination which enabled them to see a real forest where actually there was only a bare platform.

To Bakshy, however, the explanation is that "the traditions of the old theatre were based on the idea of a more or less abstract plan and were thus frankly conventional . . . [but that] the traditions of the modern theatre are based on the idea of a picture of life framed by the proscenium arch, and are so far avowedly illusionistic,"

[3] Alexander Bakshy was born in Russia in 18—, but has spent most of his life in England and America. For a number of years he was dramatic critic for the *Manchester Daily Dispatch* and was a more or less regular contributor to *The English Review*, *Theatre Craft*, and *Drama*. For over ten years he wrote the film criticism for *The Nation*. He is known for his advanced theories and clear opinions on the aesthetics of the stage. Some of his theoretical and critical writings have been collected in his two published books, *The Path of the Modern Russian Stage and Other Essays* (London, 1916) and *The Theatre Unbound* (London, 1923), which see for all quotations from Bakshy in this paper.

and that furthermore this "abstract plan" is similar to the situation where one person tries to tell another how an accident took place on a street corner.

> Here, says the person, is a dash marking Oxford Street. Here is Regent Street [another dash]. Here is the bus [a cross]. Here is the cyclist [another cross]. Now when we look at such a plan do we call up in our imagination rows of houses and moving traffic? No, we simply regard the line and the cross as standing for a street, a bus, etc. No great effort of imagination is required to realize the relations between these various objects. And this is exactly how the stage was seen in the old theatre . . . this was amply sufficient to give the audience the plan of the situation.

These "avowedly illusionistic traditions" of the modern theatre are fetters, in Bakshy's eyes, that must be unbound before the theatre can go on to higher development and a freer life. He laments that we use the theatre as if it were not a theatre doing our best to pretend that it is something else; we make it "representational"; we force it to make believe that its shows are not theatrical shows but bits of "actual" life transported to the theatre.

The theatre like all art, he says, must, indeed can only, present "ideal" truth, truth that is conditioned by the relation between the observer and the work of art. "The mutual freedom between the observer and the object of his contemplation . . . constitutes the ideality of their relationship and qualifies the reality of the object or work as an 'ideal reality' as opposed to the 'actual reality' based on dependence."

Actors today, says Bakshy, are no longer really actors for they are pretending all the time actually *to be* the characters they are representing. Rather than this, they should retain their own integrity as actors and "present" the play in terms of the theatre. In other words he believes in a "frank theatricality or staginess."

> . . . The staginess of the play will mean an exhibition of life in terms of the theatre . . . Nor will the playwright in showing or presenting his drama, be bound by considerations of realistic, psychological, or some supernatural truth, and in bodying it forth on the stage, he will be free to treat his material —the elements of human character and action—in any fashion he may choose so long as his convention is made intelligible, is theatrical in its nature, and lays no claim to be anything but a method of presentation.

To Bakshy the purpose of the theatre is not to present a picture of some literal truth but to present human relationships by means of thoughts embodied in words and actions. If these relationships are truthfully portrayed, it is immaterial whether or not the whole picture is realistically consistent. Thus a Japanese Nō drama with

all its non-realistic conventions may be more poetically true than a modern "slice-of-life" play.

Sheldon Cheney has stated fundamentally the same thing in comparing the stage to other arts. There has been, he points out,

> . . . a well-defined struggle to free the stage from the obsession of representation and imitation, to free it for creative expressiveness; to find ways of escape from the sphere of sentiment, anecdote, plot-weaving, and photography, into a sphere where beauty of form might be locked with the release of the spirit.[4]

His words "sentiment, anecdote, plot-weaving, and photography" all describe an uncreative *imitation* of life, but the elimination of these faults does not necessarily imply the banishment from the stage of all naturalistic elements. The physical proportions of the actor will remain what they are in the real world, as will often properties, costumes, etc.

However, the realistic elements of the stage must not be used for an imitative photographic *purpose*, but must be dedicated to the higher function of lifting the spectator into that sphere "where beauty of form may be locked with the release of the spirit," where the spectator may be taken from his everyday life into an emotionally exalted one containing the exciting sense of a super-ego which seems to perceive with heightened clearness. In such a state the spectator may be for a time subject to the illusion that he is vicariously living the life portrayed on the stage, but he must be able to pass naturally and easily from this illusion into the aesthetic state that understands and evaluates this experience, that sees relationships between it and the real world, between it and himself. He must be allowed to return from the illusion to a consciousness of his own personality and the make-believe quality of the theatre world with no sense of jar to his day-dream.

That there may be an intermingling of the illusion state and the aesthetic state, Bakshy does not seem to admit. To him all the drama is divided into the two classes "representational" and "presentational," the former involving the illusion state and the latter being free of it. It is the illusion experience, according to him, that is destructive of the aesthetic experience, and should therefore be eliminated.

While the two experiences cannot exist simultaneously, it seems more than likely that the illusion experience may be useful in making the aesthetic experience possible by exciting the emotions and keying

[4] *A Primer of Modern Art*, p. 339.

the spectator to a receptive mood. The illusion must be created, however, in such a way that the spectator will pass beyond it into the higher perceptive state, to produce which is the main function of art. In the presentational drama the spectator creates his own illusion, retaining at the same time a subconscious awareness of himself and the theatre, realizing that the theatrical elements before him are but mediums of expressing some invisible reality, conventional symbols of an idea. However, in the representational drama the spectator enters the revery world to stay there until arbitrarily brought back from it by some stage inconsistency, and it is this arbitrary return that is distressing.

The presentational point of view is not opposed to any one type of staging; it is opposed to any and all whose ultimate objective is but the creation of an illusion of the outside world—not because illusion is subversive of art, but because neither illusion nor art can be served best in this manner. The presentational method can use at will naturalistic, conventional, or expressionistic materials; for all art part of the theatrical medium, but this method is careful that the audience creates its own illusion, an illusion which does not depend upon a perfect reproduction of reality on the stage. Thus the spectator may pass quite naturally from this land of illusion to the land of aesthetic experience where eternal and universal human problems and relationships are revealed without the shock that comes from the realization that he has been deceived, for there has been no deception.

This sense of shock experienced at the unrealistic behavior of what has been accepted as realistic material, is one of the most practical reasons for turning from the representational to the presentational attitude in theatre production. As stated before, inherent technical difficulties prevent the achievement of perfect illusion through either exact or impressionistic imitation, but it is possible to create illusion by another and far more certain method.

First, however, the factors controlling this creation must be determined, as must the relation of illusion to art. The aesthetic experience has been described as involving a disinterested contemplation in which the observer feels completely free from the object and at the same time keenly aware both emotionally and intellectually of its significance and beauty, so that the impact between his personality and the "personality" of the object creates a living artwork, but it is doubtful if this experience, partaking of the nature of revelation, is ever present in a completely pure form. We cannot look upon the invisible; we must see it "as in a mirror, darkly"—and that mirror

is illusion. To experience this illusion of another world is, as has been said, to surrender the ego; to experience the aesthetic emotion is, once again, to enhance, to heighten the power of the ego.

Thus these two phenomena satisfy two of the most basic human desires, to lose oneself and to find oneself. Not only that, these desires are a manifestation of the fundamental contradiction of existence, a contradiction which shows itself in the inevitable conflict between society and the individual, between universal laws and the laws of man, expressed in innumerable phrases applied to art and life—unity and variety, the one and the many, Dionysus and Apollo.[5]

This inherent contradiction, responsible for the tragedy and comedy in life, constitutes life's mystery and furnishes the material for art—art, which makes it possible to reconcile temporarily all that is apparently irreconcilable. Of the two desires, the desire for illusion and the desire for the aesthetic experience, the desire to lose oneself and the desire to find oneself, the former is the more human, the latter the more godlike. Everyone has experienced the former, but only a comparative few the latter.

The realist, recognizing this desire for illusion, attempts to satisfy it, without realizing its immense power, without realizing that this power will create if unimpeded by inconsistencies in the designer's petty makeshifts a far more perfect and complete illusion than he could ever build unaided upon his stage. He fails to realize that his purpose should be rather to leave this desire free not only to create its own illusion, but to pass from this created illusion to the ensuing attitude of "disinterested contemplation."

That the spectator is free at times to make this transition even in viewing a realistic production is true solely because the production happens to be free from any inconsistent elements which would arbitrarily destroy the illusion. This will be true only when the play is an ideal vehicle for realistic methods. However, there are many plays, notably Shakespeare's, that are not of this type. A supernaturalistic production of *Macbeth*, for example, is bound to come to grief in more than one respect.

As Bakshy says of a production at Drury Lane, elaborate scenery, witches in clouds of steam, a spot-light for the ghost may be there to produce the illusion of something that is not a stage but a heath, a camp, a room in a castle. Unfortunately, however, Shakespeare apparently did not intend his plays for this sort of production and

[5] *The Path of the Modern Russian Stage* contains a discussion relative to art on Dionysus and Apollo.

seems determined to frustrate all attempts at illusionistic effects. To quote:

> [Shakespeare] made the ghost of Banquo invisible to all except Macbeth and the latter's agitated speeches inaudible to all except Banquo. But if one could perhaps devise some means of making the ghost invisible, so as to create a realistic picture of the situation, how could the guests be prevented from hearing Macbeth? Surely no one will suggest stopping their ears with cotton wool or deafening them in some other way. It is clear that the problem can have no solution on the realistic or any other picture stage. But the moment you agree to substitute a *plan* of the situation for a *picture* stage, the difficulty ceases to exist—when characters are *supposed* not to see or hear one another, it makes not a whit of difference whether they actually do so or not.

In the last analysis the quarrel, which has been conceived as a struggle between realist and anti-realist, is not a conflict over the manner or style of production, not a controversy over what conventions shall be judged acceptable, but a disagreement as to the nature and function of stage illusion.

The disciple of representation, believing the illusion all-important, considers its creation the purpose of the theatre. Even though he may wish to use this illusion to embody some inner vision, in committing himself above all else to the copying of nature he has bound himself to the laws of nature. In trying to serve two masters, nature and art, he finds himself involved in continued conflict. When his art would speak directly, it must instead employ circumlocuitous language, impeded by naturalistic restraints. Thus the creation is weakened to whatever extent the inner vision has had to be changed to fit its naturalistic embodiment.

On the other hand the believer in presentation finds at his command every stage convention and theatrical medium as a means for incarnating his vision. Whatever does not serve his purpose can be rejected; he is free to express himself directly. Nor will he be led to pledge allegiance to any school of stage design, nor to commit himself to any avowed "method" of production. Realizing that his audience will accept any device that is truly expressive, once the novelty has worn off, he will create freely, hoping only that he find himself endowed with a quickened imagination and sensitive perception with which to interpret the outer world in terms of the theatre, that his audience may have deeper insight into life through the sensuous perceptions he has embodied.

There are many indications that the theatre is swinging slowly away from the picture-of-life sort of realism, the sort that either denies or forgets the theatre and hopes that the spectator will do

likewise. O'Neill's plays give evidence of this change in their use of masks and asides and other devices—theatrical tricks as they have been scathingly called—as less consistently do plays by some other of our modern playwrights. Much of the dialogue of Philip Barry is certainly not realistic, nor is that of Noel Coward. The whole structure of *Green Pastures* is diagrammatic with the naive air of a child's drawing. The latest of O'Neill's "tricks" appears in his current play *Day Without End*, wherein the protagonist is presented by two actors, the one expressing the natural every-day appearance of the character, the other, wearing a mask and always accompanying the first like an evil shadow, expressing the lower side of his nature. Many people object to such an explicit confrontation of the forces, claiming the inner struggle could be better sensed were it presented in the more usual way through the use of realistic subtleties. Possibly it is true that O'Neill's method does not show to best advantage as he has here used it, but it remains an effective example of the presentational point of view.

If the playwrights are beginning to reclaim their birthright and to compose, not pieces of literature in the form of plays, but works which belong solely to the theatre and can be expressed in no other medium, even more are the designers thinking and creating purely theatrically, though as yet the most significant projects have not been used in actual productions. Among the many new stage projects, shown at this year's International Theatre Exhibition in New York, will be found designs by Jo Mielziner, Lee Simonson, Norman Bel Geddes, Gorelik, Essman, and many others. Lee Simonson has based his design for *Hamlet*

> not on a pictorial but on a production idea: Hamlet is usually made a black figure in a gloomy world. That to me misses the dramatic point entirely. I've made him a black figure in a bright world. My scheme is designed to emphasize his isolation in a guzzling sensuous, luxurious court. Hence the centre of the castle is a heavy red, the columns and the arches deliberately gross and squat. Every time the court assembles it heightens that glow of red and gold . . . And everywhere Hamlet moves against this brightness, in solitary protest, uniquely black.[6]

All of the elements in Simonson's project are real, none are realistic, i.e., none of them pretend to be something they are not. Such designs, even though as yet existent only on paper, point to a new creative spirit in the theatre that parallels the anti-realistic current

[6] This project with a number of others was reproduced in the February issue of *Theatre Arts Monthly*, from which I quote Lee Simonson's note to his design, which seems to deny the implication of his book.

in the graphic arts. When we have more playwrights who will create with a knowledge and grasp of the theatre medium like that of O'Neill, and who will have a depth of understanding and insight, the designers will be ready, and we shall have an art of the theatre that is aesthetically valid.

A BEHAVIORISTIC INTERPRETATION OF LANGUAGE

J. STANLEY GRAY
University of Pittsburgh

SCIENTIFICALLY, man differs from the lower animals only in the greater complexity of his central nervous system, which results in greater variability of behavior. Of course the mentalists have postulated a psychic difference in addition to physical differences, but it is fruitless to discuss such a postulation as non-physical data can neither be proved to exist nor proved not to exist. We shall thus deal only with those differences which are objective and can be proved by scientific technique. Weiss says, "The difference between man and animal lies in man's greater behavior potentialities and this is due to greater variety in the inter-connections between sense organs and muscles."[1]

Man's greater central neural complexity has enabled him to excel the lower animals in two types of behavior—manual manipulation and language. No other animal can use his hands so skillfully as can *homo sapiens*. This type of dexterity has enabled him to build skyscrapers, ocean liners, air craft, radios, telescopes, microscopes, railroads and all the physical complexities of civilization. But language behavior has been of even greater value to man in building his civilization. It has enabled him to live in a vicarious world which may be a copy of the world as it has been in the past, or of the world as it is at present, or of the world as it may be in the future. Through language man lives in an environment which transcends both time and space. In speaking of language, Dewey says, "Events turn into objects or things with meaning. They may be referred to when they do not exist, and thus be operative among things distant in space and time, through vicarious presence in a new medium."[2]

[1] Weiss, A.P., "The Aims of Social Evolution," *Ohio Journal of Science*, XXIII (1923), 118.

[2] Dewey, John, *Experience and Nature*, (1929), p. 166.

In behavioristic psychology, language is considered as conditioned behavior. It is any form of substitute stimulation or symbolization. When one thing is a signal for another, it is called language. When the chicken hen sees a shadow flash by and gives a characteristic cackle-cry which always signifies danger to other chickens, she is using language. When the jungle beasts give animal cries, each characteristic of some general state of affairs (danger, conquest, mating, etc.), they are using language. When one animal signals to another, whether by vocal sound or by some other means (hair-erection, feather-display, death-feigning, etc.), it is using language. This is another way of saying that language is communication; that it enables hearers to know unknown situations.

However, we are here interested primarily in human language. How does it differ, if at all, from the more rudimentary animal language? First, human language is more variable than animal language and hence more useful. Because the human has a much larger vocabulary than the animal, he is able to signal a great many more details of a situation. The hen can merely announce "danger" and is unable even to describe the nature of it. Her vocabulary is so limited that she has only a single word (or cry) for all danger situations. On the other hand, the human (because of a greater vocabulary) can describe the details of a situation so that hearers can know the location, the immediacy and the nature of the danger. Human language is thus more useful because it describes an unseen and unknown situation more in detail. It communicates more information than does animal language. It thus has a greater value in the struggle for existence.

Another significant difference between lower animal language and human language is that of predication or the ability to use sentences. The lower animals can use only single words and as de Laguna explains, "Speech which is limited to the sentence-word can mediate co-operative action only with reference to a situation which is perceptually present to both parties concerned."[3] The single word is too limited in its communicative value to make it effective in bringing about co-operative action in those situations which are not known to both parties. Because of predication ability humans can describe situations in such detail that, even though they are unknown to the hearers, they can become so vicariously exact as to enable co-operative

[3] De Laguna, Grace, *Speech: Its Function and Development*, (New Haven, 1927), p. 94.

activity. For example, a wounded hunter can describe a trail so exactly to another who is unacquainted with it, that the other can traverse it and secure aid. Non-sentence using animals cannot do this, and hence are limited in their co-operative behavior. A sentence-word using animal cannot analyze and describe in sufficient detail to make co-operation possible.

We shall now observe (1) the development of language both in the race (philogeny) and in the individual (ontongeny) in order to understand (2) the values of language in human civilization. If language is the distinguishing trait about humans, it would seem to merit more consideration than is usually given it. Mentalistic psychology has always considered language merely as a means of expression, as a medium through which the mind could make itself known. For the behaviorist, who ignores the postulated mind, language takes on a changed significance. It is no longer a means of expressing ideas, but it constitutes in itself that behavior usually designated as mental.

A. The Philogeny of Language

There have been various theories developed as to the evolution of language. Darwin presented the "interjectional" or "pooh-pooh" theory. This was that words originated as characteristic vocal expressions of emotion and then became symbolical of the respective emotions. Typical examples are "ouch," "pshaw," "ugh," "ha, ha," "ah," etc.

The onomatopoetic or "bow-wow" theory is that words developed as copies of the sounds made by the objects referred to. For example, "purring" as a word sounds very much liks its meaning. Other examples are "mumbling," "bumble bee," "cough," "slam," "buzz," "moan," "chickadee," "crackle," etc.

The pathognomic or "ding-dong" theory as developed by Max Müller is that words developed in a sort of mystic harmony with the objects which they represent. Thus, words suggest their own meanings, as "bubble," "zigzag," "weird," "terror," etc.

Noire developed the "ye-he-ho" theory which is that "language arose from common emotional expressions in group occupations, as illustrated in the rhythmic action in a group rowing a boat." The words "heave" and "swish" perhaps developed in this manner.

However it is evident that none of these theories is sufficient to explain the development of all language symbols. They are all partial theories and no doubt explain the development of a few words but

are supplementary to each other. In fact, it is very doubtful if all four theories together explain even a majority of the words in any language. Each word has its own history of development which, in many cases, is peculiar only to itself. The origin of many words is purely accidental as illustrated in the earliest vocabularies of infants. The word for doll may be "yum-yum" or "ochca" or "hito," depending on the peculiar sound which the mother hears the infant accidentally make at some time when he is playing with a doll. Etymology cannot be explained by any one specific theory such as those listed above.

The problem of the philogeny of language can only be understood when the conditions under which language first developed are understood. Language behavior did not come about merely because the language apparatus developed in the evolution of organic structure. The equipment for language behavior existed long before it was used for that purpose. Those races with primitive language behavior have just as highly developed language mechanism as have our most civilized races. Man had the structure long before he had the language. The origin of language has an environmental rather than a structural explanation. Language developed (in those organisms that already possessed the necessary structure for it) because some sort of an environmental change necessitated it. Language behavior became essential to environmental adjustment and then the structure, which had long been present, functioned in that way.

The nature of this environmental change which was great enough to cause the development of the most important form of behavior in the entire evolution of organic life, is entirely unknown. Anthropologists can tell us so little of primitive life before the language stage that any explanation is largely speculative. De Laguna presents one of the most plausible suggestions when she says, "The conditions which determined its (referring to language) appearance were probably those arising from and accompanying the transition from an arboreal to a terrestrial mode of life."[4] (The study of the skeletons of those animals immediately preceding *dawn man* indicates that they lived in trees, as do our modern apes.) The descent from tree living to ground living was due, perhaps, to extreme changes in climate, known to have taken place during the Glacial age which destroyed the forests and made necessary extreme alteration of living habits. Tree living was comparatively simple in that the problems

[4] *Ibid*, p. 46.

of food, shelter and protection were solved by the manner of living. The trees furnished food, hollow trees presented dens of shelter without construction effort, and danger which was usually terrestrial could be escaped by climbing trees. Living was so simple and easy that it was largely individualistic. Co-operation between individuals was not necessary and so language did not exist.

However, the descent to terrestrial abode increased the problems of living to such an extent that the habits of living which were developed in the trees were useless. Man now had to hunt for food (and perhaps store it for later use), build living quarters which would protect against both climate and hostile enemies, provide for children during a longer period of infancy than existed during arboreal living, and combat disease, vermin, night prowlers and other difficulties characteristic of ground living. Such enormous and deadly problems were solved only by those individuals who learned to *co-operate* with other individuals and meet problems as a group instead of individually. Those who did not co-operate simply did not survive. They were annihilated by conditions which did not exist in arboreal living and which they were not trained to meet. Survival now necessitated the co-operative activity of the group.

The tool for co-operation was language. Language developed because it became necessary. Survival necessitated co-operation and co-operation necessitated language. Let us illustrate this fact by an illustration from hunting. Notice first that man is not structurally equipped for hunting as are wolves and dogs and lions. Because of this, he must use tools or weapons, which at such a primitive stage of civilization could only have been of the utmost crudity. As the hunted animals were more swift, more keen sensed, and in many cases more strong, primitive man had to hunt in groups. They made up in numbers what they lacked in individual qualifications. Some perhaps acted as "drivers" while others were stationed at strategic "crossings" with their crude weapons. When a "kill" was made they then carried it to their cave or place of abode and thus were able to survive. In all this, language was essential. Who should "drive" and where, who should "stand post" and where, when to begin the hunt and when to quit, what animals should be hunted, how to proceed after the kill was made, how to cook or prepare the food for eating, etc., are some of the problems that could have been solved only by the use of language. Other phases of terrestrial living presented even more complicated problems and language was even more essential.

Whether we accept de Laguna's explanation of the sudden and intense need for language or not, we must agree that it developed as a tool for social co-operation. It was born of necessity and became the most outstanding means of survival and supremacy. Of course, as de Laguna points out, it could not have existed had not primitive man possessed a "nervous organization sufficiently complex and flexible to permit him to reassemble, on a higher level, the elements of simpler and now inadequate responses."[5] Those animals that did not possess this structure, and hence could not develop language, did not survive.

B. The Ontogeny of Language

When the child sees an object or a movement or hears a sound, he responds to it by a series of random movements involving most of his striped musculature. Much of this movement will be of the laryngeal muscles and will cause vocal sound. We say that the child babbles in response to the various forms of stimulation. Many of these sounds will be supplemented by various forms of approval behavior by the parent or nurse and hence will tend to be repeated (a simple case of *facilitation* or *re-enforcement*). The child will thus learn to imitate himself and, as de Laguna explains, "We can imitate acts of others only if we are already able to perform the same kind of act ourselves, or at least the elementary acts of which they are composed. We can imitate only in so far *as we have already learned to imitate ourselves*. . . . Many acts, originally performed by chance, act as stimuli to their own repetitions."[6]

Then the nurse will associate certain vocal sounds with certain objects by handling the object, and letting the child handle it, while at the same time uttering the appropriate vocal sound and encouraging the child to utter it. This is a simple case of conditioned response similar to Pavlov's classic example of sound-of-bell, sight-of-meat, saliva-flow.[7] After a few experiences of this sort, the word will become the substitute stimulus for the object.

Let us illustrate the process by a specific example. Suppose that a child has learned to respond to a ball, let us say, by the usual manipulating and babbling responses. He accidentally babbles sounds which resemble the word "ball" while the watching parents vigor-

[5] *Ibid*, p. 51.
[6] *Ibid*, p. 66.
[7] Pavlov, I., *The Conditioned Reflex*, (1928).

ously pronounces the word "ball." These two sounds act on his auditory receptors and supplement whatever form of stimulation caused him to babble the original near-ball sound. He then babbles a new sound which probably is more like "ball" because of more adequate stimulation. This stimulates the parent to still more vigorous language behavior which, in turn, stimulates the child more adequately yet, and a fairly accurate pronunciation of the word "ball" soon results.

However, this behavior is not yet language but only supplementary to the child's various forms of manipulating responses to a ball. It is just an additional way of playing with a ball, and may be released by a great many visual, tactual, and kinaesthetic forms of stimulation associated with the ball. Now suppose that some day the ball is in sight but out of reach. The sight is enough to set off many ball responses including the verbal response "ball." The parent then fetches the ball while he himself utters the sound. A few repetitions of this situation brings about a conditioned response and the word "ball" becomes a substitute stimulus for the ball. By and by the ball becomes associated with many environmental factors (through being experienced with these factors) such as other toys, the play room, play situations, other children, etc. Anyone of these may set off the ball-substitute response (i.e., the vocalized "ball"). This stimulates the parent or playmates to produce the ball and the child learns that he can use certain vocalized behavior to bring about certain behavior in other individuals. When this stage is reached he has learned to behave in that way called language (Weiss called it *biosocial* response). Vocalized behavior becomes language only when it is used to bring about specific behavior in other individuals. Further language development consists fundamentally of the same process. Even those complicated forms of language behavior known as generalization consist simply of forming more conditioned responses.[8]

In conclusion, the behaviorist finds that the development of language can be given a non-vitalistic explanation. It is not necessary to postulate *psyche* in order to explain how moving protoplasm can learn to behave in a certain way in order to affect the behavior of other protoplasm. Protoplasm behaves in accordance with the same fundamental laws of movement as non-protoplasmic substance. Lan-

[8] Such learning does not necessitate the mind postulate. See a behavioristic explanation of learning in Gray, J. Stanley, "A Biological View of Behavior Modification," *Jour. Educ. Psy.*, Nov. 1932.

guage using organisms do not transcend the laws governing all movement in the universe. For the behaviorist the fundamental laws of physics will explain language and all other forms of organic behavior. Man is assumed to live in a closed energy universe and subject to those laws which govern it. Language is interpreted as a form of organic movement which acts on the sensory receptors of other organisms and therefore stimulates them to respond to situations which are absent in whole or in part. It is a characteristic of organisms, but, as the writer has explained in another publication,[9] it is not unknown among inorganic machines. Its development, of course, is different but in neither case are the laws of electron-proton movement continuum violated.

AUDIENCE-REACTION TO SYMPOSIUM

WILLIAM A. D. MILLSON
Western Reserve University

WITHOUT attempting to join our perrenial joustings over the usefulness of debate—a jousting once again revived last spring season by the versatile lance of Professor Dayton McKean[1]—it is the function of this article to report the results of the use of a new procedure[2] for argumentation called here a "symposium," and to report these results in terms of the opinion-change of members of our audience under speaking conditions permitted by this new form of discussion of controversial questions.

Presumably the ultimate test of the value of the present formal speaking procedure employed for debate will be the effect upon the training of student debaters and upon its relationship to audience-reaction. Presumably too our purpose is to train students to meet adequately those life-situations in which argument is an essential mechanism for solution of the problems involved and which are most likely to arise in his personal life or his professional capacity. One way to test the value of any new method of speaking procedure in relation to the audience and to the life-situation is to collect statistical data from many sources that we may use to describe for us the dis-

[9] Gray, J. Stanley, "A Behavioristic Interpretation of Intelligence," *Psy. Rev.*, XXXIX (1932), 271–78.

[1] Dayton D. McKean, "Debate or Conference," *Q. J. S.*, XX (1934), 223–35.

[2] See A. B. Williamson, "A Proposed Change in Intercollegiate Speaking," *Q.J.S.*, XIX (1933), 182–205.

tribution and change of opinion within audiences, which serve as experimental subjects for the new procedure. One such source is reported here, not as conclusive evidence relative to opinion change during a symposium; but as a suggestive study permitting tentative conclusions subject to the corroboration of data obtained from like procedures with other audiences in other places and at other periods.

Our method will be to record and group for analysis ballots in each class of original opinion, for the subject of the symposium, to record opinion-change for each class or original opinion, and to make the possible inferences as to the probable significance of this distribution and flux of opinion during symposium.

The Symposium Procedure and Purpose

The "symposium" method as modified for use at Western Reserve University departs from formal debating procedure in the following particulars:

1. No attempt is made to select and phrase an exact and rigid debating proposition. A general subject is selected, the problem involved is agreed upon by all the speakers and is stated for the audience by one of the speakers, whose sole task is to state the problem for which solutions will be offered.

2. In the balloting for expression of opinion-change, each member of the audience is permitted to select one of several proposed solutions for a stated problem, rather than express a choice for or against a specifically phrased proposition representing but one solution for the problem. In each case, however, there is opportunity to indicate indecision.

3. Speakers do not represent teams and have no "colleagues." Each presents his individual views.

4. Each speaker has a different function; one states the problem for discussion; three or four propose different solutions; three or four cross-examine the advocates, to ascertain both strength and weakness in the plans suggested; one summarizes the problem, the solutions, and the results of cross-examination. All speakers had opportunity to examine the statement of the problem posed by the first speaker before delivery.

5. The total time of speaking is one hour and forty minutes rather than one hour and thirty.

The exact speaking procedure was as follows:

1. An Exposition of the Problem of Economic Reconstruction for the United States—20 minutes—Western Reserve University.

2. A Proposal of the National Recovery Act as a Possible Solution—15 minutes—Western Reserve University.

3. Cross-Examination to Ascertain Strength or Weakness in the National Recovery Act—5 minutes—Wooster College.

4. A Proposal of Socialism as a Possible Solution—15 minutes—Oberlin College.

5. Cross-Examination to Ascertain Strength or Weakness in Socialism—5 minutes—Ohio Wesleyan University.

6. A Proposal of Fascism as a Possible Solution—15 minutes—Wooster College.

7. Cross-Examination to Ascertain Strength or Weakness in Fascism—5 minutes—Western Reserve University.

8. A Proposal of Laissez Faire as a Possible Solution—15 minutes—Ohio Wesleyan University.

9. Cross-Examination to Ascertain Strength or Weakness in Laissez Faire —5 minutes—Oberlin College.

10. A Summary of the Problem, of the Solutions and of the Results of Cross-Examination—10 minutes—Western Reserve University.

This particular symposium was conducted at Taylor Hall, Wooster College, Wooster, Ohio, on April 23rd, 1934. Before and after the discussion, an audience of town people and students was balloted for expression of individual opinion as to the solution for the stated problem. The ballot form permitted members of the audience to check preference for any of the four proposals or to indicate an "undecided" opinion regarding the correct solution for the problem. In so far as we know this is the first test of the methods of symposium in terms of an analysis of audience-reaction, and opinion-change.

In devising this system of discussion and in securing the co-operation of Professor Emerson W. Miller, W. Roy Diem, and Marvin O. Bauer, respectively representing Wooster College, Ohio Wesleyan University and Oberlin College, my chief interest was in the effect of such a discussion upon the audience-opinion. Would there be as great a change of opinion for this method of speaking as for formal debate? Would there be relatively more or fewer "undecided" before or after the discussion than for debate. Would there be more or fewer unchanged opinions after the discussion? How does the data relative to opinion-change for symposium compare with the norms for debate reported[3] by Professor H. S. Woodward?

The Statistical Results

The tabulation of the symposium ballots inscribed in Table I gives the distribution of audience-opinion "before" and "after" the discussion. In this and in other tables, NRA is represented by N—Socialism by S—Fascism by F—Laissez Faire by L—Undecided by U.

There is indicated here a substantial change of opinion in an audience to which are presented various points of view. It is evident

[3] H. S. Woodward, "Measurement and Analysis of Audience-Opinion," *Q. J. S.*, XIV (1928), 94-111.

that opinion-change is not dependent upon centering audience-attention upon an artificially phrased debate proposition under the conditions of debate.

TABLE I

Total Initial and Final Opinion Distribution for Symposium

	Total	N	S	F	L	U
Before Discussion	122	28	51	3	9	31
After Discussion	122	40	34	10	12	26
		+12	−17	+7	+3	−5

A comparison of these totals with those reported in 1928 by H.S. Woodward indicates however a distinct variance in the type of opinion-distribution for symposium as offered to that for debate. Woodward in summary states (p. 99), "First on every subject except cancellation of war debts there was a larger affirmative than negative vote"; and (p. 102) "Where the audience has less knowledge, the number of undecided voters exceeds the number of those who held an initial opinion."

If we consider a vote for one proposal as a vote against the other alternative, then for the first statement there is a superficial similarity in this instance since Socialism has fifty-one initial ballots as against forty for the three other solutions, combined. And the number of "Undecided" does not exceed the vote for "Fascism," "Laissez Faire," and the NRA, separately. It may be that "Laissez Faire" was an unknown term to this audience, which would account for the surprisingly low vote here; certainly the term has less emotional connotation than "Capitalism" might have had. Yet it is obvious that these so-called "Negative" votes for debate may represent many strictly opposing views (here, Fascism and Laissez Faire!) and that the number of "Undecided" is not likely to exceed the number of those "who held an initial opinion" provided opportunity is given to indicate a full choice. The debate procedure may possibly compel an artificial expression of opinion:—the "Undecided" and the "Negative" are not necessarily or really "Undecided" or "Negative"; they may lack opportunity for expression of real opinion on the standard debate ballot for the actual problem involved in a formal debating proposition.

But we do not know yet how these changes in opinion took place, nor how closely they compare with those opinion-reactions which occur under conditions of formal debating procedure. Exact-opinion-movement may be ascertained by examination of Table II.

This table does not indicate the actual shift in opinion recorded for three ballots. One originally for "Socialism," states that it favored "NRA" at the end as a means toward Socialism but had to be recorded as unchanged by its marking. One "Socialism" ballot was invalid since checked both "Socialism" and "Undecided" at the end; one invalid ballot began with both "NRA" and "Socialism" and ended at "Laissez Faire."

An examination of the table reveals no great variance in the type of opinion-shift which we would *a priori* expect if the recorded votes actually represent the influence of discussion rather than mere votes

TABLE II

Shift of Opinion During Symposium

Before Discussion		After Discussion				
		N	S	F	L	U
N	28	22	3	0	0	3
S	51	8	29	4	0	10
F	3	0	0	1	0	2
L	9	1	0	1	7	0
U	31	9	2	4	5	11
Total	122	40	34	10	12	26

for schools or mere taking of enforced position for the sake of co-operating in the balloting. Two-thirds of the "Undecided" made up their minds; seventeen percent of those having an opinion became "Undecided"; while a full 70 of the original 122 valid ballots remained unchanged in opinion. It should be noted also that the factor of the home audience (with the Wooster College speaker favoring Fascism at Wooster) apparently played a negligible part in influencing the various types of opinion-shift. It is an interesting question whether this would be true if one of the participating schools were *debating* Wooster in the customary manner.

There still remains a comparison of symposium audience opinion-shift with the norms of opinion-shift for debate. Reference has been made to the statistical study of data obtained by use of the standard debate ballot reported by H. S. Woodward in 1928. His examination of 3540 valid ballots representing a period of three years in the use of a standardized opinion ballot for eight separate propositions tended to establish validity of the ballot as a device to record shift-of-opinion in the speech-situation and enabled us to set up for debate the norms of audience-reaction to which all data collected for opinion-shift in particular audiences may be related for purposes of comparison.

The validity of this ballot as a means of recording audience-opinion was further substantiated in 1932 in a report[4] to the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH of the results of an experimental study of audience-reaction by use of the ballot to record opinion under laboratory conditions.

Tables III and IV contain a comparison of the data obtained for symposium (Table II) and of the data contained in the Woodward tables and graphs (*Q.J.S.*, XIV, 621-633). In both tables, "debate" is represented by the symbol "D," and "symposium" by "S." Table III is concerned solely with the effect on the initial opinion groups, as such, and its percentages relate to the total number in each indicated category. The term "All Opinions" for debate refers to the combined total of negative and affirmative votes; for symposium, the combined total of those favoring the proposals of NRA, Socialism, Laissez Faire, or Fascism. Tables III and IV are given together for purposes of comparison.

TABLE III
Effect of Debate and Symposium upon Initial Opinion.

	D	S
% Unchanged		
of the Undecided	16.0	35.5
of total of all Opinions	82.0	64.8
of those for NRA	—	78.6
of those for Socialism	—	56.9
% Weakened		
of the Undecided	84.0	64.5
of total of all Opinions	17.3	35.2
of those for NRA	—	21.4
of those for Socialism	—	43.1

In the following table percentages relate to the total number of valid ballots (122), and indicate the relative increase and decrease for various categories from initial to final distribution.

In Table III, there appears to be a significant difference between debate and symposium in the relative percentage of the initially "Undecided" vote which remained "Unchanged" by the discussion—15% for debate as compared to 35% for symposium. Relative to this, Professor Woodward stated in 1928 (pp. 104-6) that there was an "approximate elimination on all subjects of the initial *undecided*

[4] William A. D. Millson, "Problems in Measuring Audience Reaction." *Q. J.S.*, XVIII (1932), 621-637.

vote," and his tables indicate a narrow variation for all subjects from 13% to 18%. The undecided vote which remained "Undecided" is twice as large for symposium as for debate. This may mean either that debate permits a selection of position without presenting the alternative propositions adequately, or that the undecided group is so "weak-minded" as to be swayed into greater confusion by several alternative solutions rather than by presentation of a choice for or against a specific proposition. In either case, there is a tentative indication of a more adequate expression of opinion through the symposium ballot and the symposium procedure.

TABLE IV

Effect of Debate and Symposium upon Total Vote in Categories

Categories of Opinion	D		S		Increase—Decrease
	% Before	% After	% Before	% After	
Affirmative	36.5 to	46.7	——	——	+10.2
Negative	30.4 to	43.6	——	——	+13.6
Undecided	32.8 to	9.8	——	——	—23.0
Undecided	——	——	25.4 to	21.3	— 4.1
NRA	——	——	22.1 to	32.8	+11.6
Socialism	——	——	41.8 to	27.9	—13.9
Fascism	——	——	2.5 to	8.2	+ 5.7
Laissez Faire	——	——	7.4 to	9.8	+ 2.4

Not so for the percentage of unchanged for those who took an initial position; debate has almost one-quarter more remaining in position (82% as against 65%). That 82% of "all opinions" remaining "Unchanged" for debate represents here the total percentage reported by H. S. Woodward in 1928 for those original affirmative and negative votes which remained affirmative and negative or had the original opinion "strengthened," as permitted by the Woodward standard ballot.

Here again, there is indication of a likelihood that the symposium permits a less artificial expression of opinion than does formal debate procedure. Where several solutions are offered and the contest element for and against any one of them not emphasized, we would expect a priori and for the better an indication of less strengthening of opinion in the original groups, than is found in the excessive totals reported for debate in 1928, and an increase in the relative percentage of "Undecided" voters.

This table also contains totals for the NRA and for Socialism, since we have here a comparably large initial group of voters. They indicate that the top percentage of "Unchanged" for NRA under

symposium is below the norm for debate, while that for Socialism is almost one-third under it.

If the standard debate ballot did not provide for an additional category of "Strengthened" opinion, the percentage of "Weakened" would be the reverse of the percentage of "Unchanged" for debate as it is for symposium. As it is, there is ground for additional comparison. Again we find significant variance. The observation as to the undecided is of course the same. But of those taking an original position, almost twice as many are weakened by symposium (35% as compared with 17% for debate); a norm of debate not reached by the low percentage of weakening for the NRA. Since this relates to opinions shifting from one position to another, it may indicate that debate offers the audience inadequate opportunity to shift or presents too narrow horizons to suggest shift of opinion. It might possibly indicate greater confusion of mind induced by multiplicity of choice. But it is what we would expect (*a priori*) where the audience is not asked to witness a battle over a specific proposition but has its attention directed to the whole problem.

In Table IV, we find indicated for debate what Woodward called (pp. 104-6) the "approximate elimination of all subjects of the initial undecided vote," (from 32.8% before the discussion to 9.8% after the discussion, a decrease of 23 points), whereas for symposium there was a loss of only 4 points. Since this represents not only the original unchanged neutrals but the number of those shifting to "Undecided," it may indicate that the total effect of a symposium is to maintain in the audience a greater tendency to open-mindedness than does debate. And it suggests that the fact that debate is six times more effective in driving people to take a position may be due to the fact that it encourages the contest spirit and fails to present a complete picture of the problem and its solutions. Yet further experimentation of this sort in order to substantiate these findings, might indicate on the other hand that the symposium is merely ineffective in influencing opinion. However, in view of the fact that the final total of Undecided is maintained almost equal to the original number, despite an 84% shift from undecided as indicated in Table III, this does not appear likely.

Comparison of the specific categories in Table IV indicates an increase in debate for both affirmative and negative groups of ten points and over; whereas this is true only for the NRA (an increase of 11.6 points) for symposium, and is actually just as far in decrease for Socialism, while the increases for Fascism and Laissez

Faire are comparatively small. If NRA were taken to represent the affirmative, and the other proposals the negative here, the negative would still show a decrease of 5.8 (13.9-8.1). Here again the symposium distribution of opinion seems to indicate a less artificial expression of audience opinion regarding the subject in hand. This too, however, needs substantiation by further use of the ballot under like-conditions, since we find considerable variety in reaction as between audiences and as between subjects, as reported in 1928 by H. S. Woodward.

There is good ground for believing however that the reactions of this audience to symposium were fairly typical. Particular categories of opinion distribution and opinion shift in a particular audience are always suspect relative to an established norm; but when the inferences from examination of each category lead in each case to the same conclusion with equal consistency and strength, there is prima facie evidence of normal and typical reaction, permitting tentative conclusions of some validity.

A Summary of Inferences

In summary, an examination of data obtained from balloting the audience for this new speaking procedure tentatively indicates, subject to corroboration:

1. That audience-responses to symposium before and after discussion are as varied and as frequent in a given audience as they are for debate, though the subject is general and not stated as a specific proposition but as a problem.

2. That there may be greater opportunity in symposium for genuine expression of opinion in that the positions of "Affirmative," "Undecided" and "Negative" offered by debate may fail to afford opportunity for expression of opinion relative to more than one solution of the problem involved; so that "Negative," "Undecided," or "Affirmative," may not represent real opinion.

3. That opinion shift during symposium conformed to *a priori* expectation as to categories of opinion to be expected if recorded votes actually represent opinion rather than school-affiliation or cooperative-voting.

4. That relative to the debate-norms reported in the Woodward study of 1928, there appears to be a greater tendency to maintain an undecided group as against a practical "elimination of this initial vote" for debate. Twice as many of the original neutrals remain "Unchanged"; and the movement of the original opinions toward "Unchanged" is so marked as to maintain the undecided group almost intact after the discussion.

5. That the symposium tends to weaken original opinions to a greater degree than does debate in terms of general movement to other positions. Debate with its large percentage of 82 for the combined number of "Unchanged" and "Strengthened" appears to leave a disproportionate effect of rigidity of opinion as against symposium with its relatively low 62 percent of "Unchanged." Inas-

much as symposium weakened in this instance a full twice as great a percentage of the total of original opinion as we find for the debate norm in this category of opinion-change, there may be significance to this finding.

6. There is a consistency of inference in the various types of opinion reaction such as to imply that this audience is typical in reaction to symposium. However, these conclusions must be tentative until corroborated by further similar experiment.

This completes the analysis of the data obtained in this first reported test of symposium in terms of audience-reaction. A stenographic report of the speeches used is to appear in the 1934-1935 edition of *University Debaters Annual,* published by The H. W. Wilson Company, and they may be examined by those interested to see how closely the speakers hewed to the line of their function and of the purpose of the symposium.

The Ultimate Questions

It may be pertinent here to suggest a few of the questions which will be raised by use of the symposium procedure if we should find that its validity is finally established as a useful method of public discussion. In the final analysis, the symposium procedure will stand or fall as a teaching device.

We should inquire as to which speaking procedure—debate or symposium is most likely to approximate the speaking experience of college graduates in actual life-situations in which some phase of argumentation is involved. We should ask ourselves which procedure permits most adequate training of the student for specific functions in phases of argument often employed separately in public discussion; for exposition, for cross-examination, for full argument, for summary. But more particularly must we examine the values lost in discarding the specifically phrased debating proposition. An examination of the many "new" texts on argumentation and debating in the last decade—whose appearance is primarily due to the rather late discovery by teachers of speech of the application to our field of some of the precepts of various systems of psychology—reveals no evidence that we have changed our concepts regarding the "proper" and "safe" and "essential" method for stating a subject for argumentative discussion.[5] Though we discovered psychology, we ought perhaps to inquire whether we have discovered economics,

[5] For one of the best treatments of this subject, see J. M. O'Neill and J. H. McBurney, *The Working Principles of Argument,* (Macmillan, 1932), pp. 11–28.

sociology, and political science. Since the 1890's when Professor Baker first stated the rules for framing a proposition for debate, the world has changed. We no longer live in an expanding industrial and agricultural society in which public problems are primarily local, sectional and national. Most of our local problems are involved in national problems; and these in turn involve international factors. Civilization has become so complex, that we may pertinently inquire whether most public questions of vital importance can today be safely encompassed within the narrow confines of a single declarative sentence without excluding from discussion the factors which must be evaluated if the problem involved is to be solved. We should inquire whether, in the modern world, a debate proposition by its very nature excludes from consideration, due to its specific narrow unambiguous character, factors upon which judgment in the life-situation must actually depend.

Whether or not the validity of the symposium procedure as an instrument for development of public opinion upon a public question and to secure an adequate expression of opinion from an audience is finally established, teachers of speech should give consideration to the new process as a means of training students to meet all the factors in life-situations that require the use of argument.

There is evident sufficient substance in the data reported here to justify an investigation of these general questions, and if teachers of speech find that the balance of advantage lies with symposium as a pedagogical instrument, the data seems adequate to justify its more general use.

SUBJECTIVE MEASUREMENTS IN SPEECH: A NOTE ON METHOD

WALTER H. WILKE
New York University

EXPERIMENTAL studies of speech problems are appearing at an accelerating pace and seem to be gaining in popularity. The popularity of experimental research is no guarantee, however, of its quality. An impartial evaluation of certain recent work will emphasize the weaknesses concealed behind technical terminology and imitation of laboratory processes. The obvious inference is the danger of permitting conclusions drawn from such work to become im-

bedded in speech literature as established facts and significant principles.

At some remote future date the fruits of laboratory research in voice science may make it possible, for instance, to substitute objective measurements of vocal quality for subjective judgments and opinions. Even then, however, the objective measurements would be used largely because of their greater reliability from one situation to the next, and would be based in the last analysis upon a close correlation with carefully subjective data. Whatever confidence may be attached to the decibel unit in measuring loudness, for example, dedives from the relationship of these units to subjective judgments of just noticeable differences. Moreover, since there are not yet available physical measurements of vocal qualities corresponding closely to the descriptive terms by which we distinguish variations in vocal quality, we must necessarily depend at the present time, for certain research purposes, upon subjective estimates. The necessity of relying upon a notoriously fallible procedure does not, of course, strengthen the method, and should suggest caution in the collection of data of interpretation of results.

A recent study (2)[1] making use of such subjective methods ends with several paragraphs of broad conclusions, stated with considerable finality as well as generality, upon highly important topics. In view of the importance of the subject-matter, certain aspects of the methodology of the study should be discussed.

Some of the more striking conclusions drawn by Flemming are: "Whatever it is that makes for perfection of physical and neural structure, for effective functioning, our inheritance, early training, cultural background,—whatever is behind these traits probably is also basic for a pleasant voice. The acquisition of a pleasant voice is then limited by whatever limits the presence of these characteristics. *In some instances it is physical structure as in the case of beauty; in others it is probably neural structure and functioning as in the case of good judgment and artistic ability* (italics mine) . . . There are so many significant associations between a pleasant voice and other desirable social traits that we are warranted in concluding that in order to make any fundamental improvement in the pleasing quality of the voice we must change many related characteristics of the personality." The extent to which these conclusions are valid and the

[1] Figures in parentheses refer to items listed as "References" at the end of this article.

confidence which may be attached to practical applications based on these findings, should be judged in the light of the methods used by the investigator.

The first difficulty which anyone attempting to rate individuals runs up against is the matter of attaching exact and intended meanings to the terms used on the rating scale. Many previous users of rating devices have urged the use of careful definitions to establish an unequivocal meaning, (see, for instance, Bradshaw's summary of principles of constructing rating scales (1).

No such definitions appear to have been used by Flemming, however, and raters are accordingly forced to depend on the generally accepted meaning of his terms. That this could quickly lead to differences in interpretation is apparent from a consideration of the range of meanings attached to such words as "competent," "cultured," "good judgment," etc. In the case of some of the terms it may even be feared that their generality prevented the raters from getting any clear-cut impression of the specific behavior upon which the judgment should be based (e.g., "adaptable," "tolerant," "clever," etc.).

Not only is there considerable difficulty in translating certain terms into patterns of related behavior, but the rater is in addition faced, for observed behavior which he wishes to rate, by a choice, between overlapping terms. Thus "adaptable" ordinarily includes behavior a prominent characteristic of which certainly is that it is "intelligent," and "unselfish" is ordinarily considered to bear some relation to "generous," and "tactful" to "considerate of others." The individuals who are expected to make judgments on the basis of such overlapping terms could reasonably question, if the lack of precise definitions had not already caused them to do so, just what aspects of personality are meant to be included in the various categories.

The difficulties which so clearly attach to the determination of what "trait-actions" relate to particular descriptive terms arbitrarily called "traits" constitute no new problem. It has been recognized from the beginning of such studies on "personality traits" that these supposed entities had not been established other than verbally. This trait fallacy received a tremendous set-back by the work of Hartshorne and May (4) and others, who demonstrated the even unexpectedly great specificity of such types of behavior as the investigators of personality traits seek to measure. A recent study by Lehman and Witty (5) is one of a long series in which the untena-

bility of this approach to personality measurement is clearly demonstrated. The data of the investigation just referred to show what happens when a careful understanding of the meaning of "traits" is attempted.

There are ordinarily great variations in the judgment of a large number of observers of even such unquestionably constant stimuli as the distance between two lines, or relative weights of objects. To expect anyone to make accurate judgments of such fairly simple stimulus characteristics from memory would be to place an unnecessary burden on the subject, and to invite gross inaccuracies. If Flemming's report is complete, it would appear that in the case of the judgments of "pleasant voice," surely far more complex and difficult to rate than the stimuli just mentioned, the raters were not required to make judgments in a rigidly controlled situation, making possible the most accurate comparisons and the immediate recording of judgments, but depended on a mere recollection of the voices of the students. The application of one of the careful procedures of psychophysics or at least a standardized laboratory technique would seem imperative if valid judgments of voice quality are to be secured.

Not the least of the difficulties attending the making of a reasonable judgment regarding the pleasant or unpleasant character of the voice as studied in this experiment is the peculiarity of being forced to decide (this holds for the other characteristics rated also), whether the item could, or could not be attributed to a particular person. This artificial dichotomy ignores the evident continuum of pleasantness-unpleasantness of voice, and other personal characteristics. There is no distinct division of humanity into those who have, and those who do not have, pleasant voices. Indeed, since a large proportion are probably between the extremes, one wonders what the raters contrived to do in the case of many of their judgments.

Inasmuch as subjective data is ordinarily, even with the best of precautions, so much less reliable than good objective measures, it seems regrettable that the latter were not used in all possible cases, at least as a check to demonstrate that in this particular experiment at least the data based on judgments was valid and reliable. Certainly there are better approximations to the measurement of "intelligence" than a few ratings of the "yes -no" type. Objective data, at least in the extreme cases, would aid greatly in establishing the significance of the rating "athletic." In the one case (leadership) where records of extra-curricular activities were used, no rating was made, hence no such check is possible even in this one case. Certainly the prin-

ciple suggested by the committee on personality tests of the American Council on Education (1) that no ratings should be used if objective measurements are available is reasonable and should be followed.

Many experimental measurements have foundered on the ground of unreliability, or due to the absence of the expected relationship between the measurement and the characteristic of which it was presumably an index. Anyone who is asked to accept conclusions on the basis of experimental data is surely entitled to ask for evidence of the validity and reliability of the measurements. Flemming makes no statements with regard to either topic, and leaves the reader in doubt as to what extent the relationships found, rather low to begin with and questionable on the grounds already mentioned, may be still further attenuated by untrustworthiness of the indices. Certainly the well-known unreliability of ratings, and the low coefficients of correlation which have been found even between alternate forms of a questionnaire are sufficient warning that such data does not *ipso facto* mean all that was intended or what the name of the "trait" measured implies.

A phenomenon first noticed in 1907, and later named by Thorndike the "halo effect" is the tendency for general impressions to spread to specific traits. This coloring of the evaluation of particular aspects of behavior by the general attitude of the rater toward the individual's personality as a whole has led, since the work of Rugg (6) in 1921, to the careful study of means of minimizing this spurious relationship. A summary of these principles is given by Bradshaw (1) and by Symonds (7). It is evident that almost all of the precautions in scale construction found essential by previous investigators have been ignored by Flemming in the use of this simple check list.

It was consequently to be expected that the results of the investigation would show the suspiciously high correlations between certain variables which suggests the halo effect. Near the top of the list, showing higher correlations with "pleasant voice" than most other items, we find "beautiful of pretty," "attractive personal appearance" and "smiling countenance." Surely it is more reasonable to conclude that such factors show a close relation to ratings for "pleasant voice" because the raters have a general favorable or unfavorable estimate of the individual and fail to analyze out the independent variables, rather than that in some mysterious manner an "attractive personal appearance" affects or is affected by voice quality. Flemming himself points out the absurdity of the inference

that improving the voice would make a girl prettier, or that clothing oneself more attractively would tend to cultivate the voice. He points out that the association between voice and beauty might indicate that both are the result of some common, more basic cause. But to look to some vague "whatever it is that makes for perfection of physical or neutral structure" for an explanation should be a last resort, to be used only when it is made clear that the conditions of the experiment preclude the correlation as a result of halo effect. It would, in fact, be reasonable to expect some true correlation between desirable aspects of social behavior, although these correlations should be low; but because of its more intimate connection with local structural peculiarities, pleasant voice in all probability bears an even lower relationship to such behavior than do those aspects more amenable to a wide range of modification. Ratings on precisely this matter of voice were among those which led Thorndike (8) to call attention to the halo effect. He had found a correlation of .63 between general merit as a teacher and voice, and correlations of .50 and .63 respectively between voice and interest in community affairs and voice and intelligence.

The preceding discussion has had to do principally with the technique used by Felmming in securing data. On the assumption that the technique was not faulty in any respect, one would still wish to know to what extent coefficients of the size obtained in this investigation are significant and warrant the assertion of relationships and the broad implications of the author's interpretations. The relationships are expressed as coefficients of contingency, based upon a two-by-two fold classification. Since Pearson's correction for broad categories has not been applied, the approximately equivalent correlation coefficient is not stated, nor is the size of the probable error computed. Even taking the coefficients at their face value, since 37 of the 41 are .30 or less, the validity of assertions of relationship should be judged in the light of the predictive value of a correlation of this magnitude. Garrett (3) has said "an r of .30 or less implies so slight a degree of overlapping that there can be a very small percentage of common elements." (p. 294). Aside from all of the other considerations which are important in evaluating the data of this experiment, it must be remembered that practically none of the forty one "relationships" described are sufficiently close to justify conclusions as to practical implications, even in general, to say nothing of in individual cases.

Finally, certain inconsistencies in the relationship of various co-

efficients should be mentioned. Despite the objections to the use of terms which overlap in meaning, as previously discussed, such overlapping could conceivably be used intentionally to check up on the internal consistency of the data. Thus one might for example ask persons to rate "unselfishness," and later on have them rate "generosity" for the purpose of finding out whether these two "traits," presumably involving similar behavior, were rated consistently. It is therefore of interest to find that whereas "unselfish" is well above the middle of the group, "generous" is the very last of the 41 items. Again, although "adaptable" seems to imply a close link to "intelligent behavior," the former is first in the list (i.e.) most closely related to pleasant voice, while the latter is next to the bottom. Surely such a disparity demands explanation. One explanation would seem to be that a significant and specific meaning for each of this long list of items simply was not involved in the ratings, so that even a considerable intercorrelation due to halo effect in the case of some items was not sufficient to obviate contradictions of a sort indicative of almost a chance distribution of correlations. These logical inconsistencies, in brief, show the combined effects of the numerous limitations of the method.

That relationships may exist which are similar to those alleged in Flemming's study is entirely possible. But they cannot validly be inferred from his data. The uncritical acceptance of broad generalizations based on subjective measurements of unknown reliability and doubtful validity, showing relationships of scant predictive value, in the face of methods open to considerable criticism, would soon lead to voice fiction rather than voice science.

References

1. Bradshaw, F. F., The American Council on Education Rating Scale, *Arch. Psychol.*, 1930, XVIII, No. 119.
2. Flemming, E. G., "Pleasant Voice," *Q. J. S.*, XX (1934), 194–199.
3. Garrett, H. E., *Statistics in Psychology and Education*, Longmans Green Co., 1926.
4. Hartshorne, H. and May, M. A., *Studies in Deceit*, The Macmillan Co., 1928.
5. Lehman, H. C. and Witty, P. A., "Faulty Psychology and Personality Traits," *Am. J. Psychol.*, XLVI (1934), 486–500.
6. Rugg, H. O., "Is the Rating of Human Character Practicable?" *J. Educ. Psychol.*, XII (1921), 425–438, 485–501; XIII (1922), 30–42, 81–93.
7. Symonds, P. M., *Diagnosing in Personality and Character*, Century, 1931.
8. Thorndike, E. L., "A Constant Error in Psychological Rating," *J. Appl. Psychol.*, IV (1920), 25–29.

THE PROFESSIONAL OUTLOOK*

J. M. O'NEILL
University of Michigan

EIGHTEEN years ago last month, I addressed this ASSOCIATION at its first annual convention on the same topic as has just been announced. Perhaps I should say, I spoke to some remote ancestor of this ASSOCIATION. It was shortly after the Creation, and the work of getting settled in the professional Garden of Eden was just well under way. So it was not this ASSOCIATION as most of you know it. The organization I addressed on that day was only a unicellular ancestor of yours. It was quite literally unicellular because, at that time, we had only one section. Our first national program consisted of four general meetings and a buffet supper. (The amoeba had already learned to ingest food.) We had five separate meetings scheduled, all told, eighteen years ago. The present program which you hold in your hands lists thirty-five separate meetings now.

Evolution has been at work at high speed. It is not only in the multiplication of our meetings in national convention that we have shown remarkable growth. In the issue of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL for October 1915, there appears an editorial about the approaching first annual convention. It reveals the fact that at the date upon which the editorial was written our Association had a total membership of 156, and the optimistic hope was expressed that by the time the first convention was called to order we might have a membership of 200. Today, we have a membership of 1639.

We have changed in the last eighteen years in almost every way in which growth and influence can be evidenced. There are a number of people here today who were present at the meeting in the Auditorium Hotel in Chicago nineteen years ago last November at which this organization was founded. I feel confident that everyone of them would tell you that, in spite of the enthusiasm and optimism with which that step was taken, no one of us envisaged a growth so rapid as it has been our privilege to witness. So I shall not repeat the speech I made in November, 1915. I should like, however, to read a quotation from it because it brings up one aspect of the professional outlook in which I think I see a marked change just now.

* Presented at the 1933 Convention of the N.A.T.S., New York City. Statistics are as of that date.

This is the statement from 1915: "The field before us is a field of *academic* endeavor. The rewards we must strive for are the rewards that come from academic success. Non-academic and extra-curricular triumphs and victories must not be the most prized distinctions. The platform and the stage must give way to the study and the classroom as the scenes of our best and most important work and our richest and most enduring rewards."

In these days of shrinking budgets, dwindling staffs, and shortened curricula, we seem in many places to be going back into a condition from which, of course, we never completely escaped in some sections, in which whatever work in speech is available to the student is available in the form of extra-curricular activities rather than in regular courses and clinics. Some of us can remember when that was pretty much the whole situation in our work—the time when the worker in our field in most places was essentially a coach rather than a teacher, and master's degrees and doctor's degrees and research publication took up relatively little of the time and attention given to speech. In many places, of course, we cannot change the situation. We have to accept it and adjust ourselves to it. I think most of us have always believed that there are sound educational values to be had from the extra-curricular exhibitions and contests in speech when that work is properly handled. If we are now to salvage all that we can from the wrecks of depression, we must pay more attention to extra-curricular work rather than less; we must insist in every way possible on sound practices and proper standards; and we must try to hold, through the agencies of extra-curricular activities, as much as we can of the advances that have been gained in the last two decades in all of our activities, both extra-curricular and curricular.

I am not advocating shrinking curricula in speech. I am recognizing that in many places curricula are shrinking. In some places, furthermore, it seems that while courses may come and courses may go, the contests go on forever. Wherever that is the situation, I am for facing it realistically and for trying to make the contests serve the ends of education as much as possible. I believe that such an attitude widely adopted may save much that would otherwise be lost of the advancement of recent years.

Some one is credited with having said that he did not care who wrote the laws of a nation if he could write the songs. If we wish to apply that old saying to our activity in this profession, we should say, in effect, that we do not care who puts on the class plays, who

coaches the prize speakers, or who tries to make the sophomores from our various hinterlands use "standard speech," if we can prescribe the programs and set the standards for our graduate degrees. Some of you may think it is a far call from the activities of our graduate schools to the singing of folk-songs, but I suppose that, behind the old saw, must have been the thought that eventually those who sing become lawmakers, or to put it another way, that even politicians evolve from beings who must have once been young and have had something of imagination and rhythm and joy in their lives. Similarly, we must hope and expect, in spite of the difficulties of depression years, that eventually, some time, somewhere, somehow, those who take graduate degrees will teach.

I have spent some time this fall in gathering data to furnish a reliable answer to the question: To what extent is such a hope or expectation actually a motivating force in this field today? It seemed to me that the figures showing the actual enrollment of candidates for advanced degrees in some part of the field of speech, in a fair sampling of the leading graduate departments in this field for the past three years and a half, would give an authoritative answer to this question. I therefore gathered together the registrations of graduate students whose major work in the graduate schools was in this field from twelve university departments. These departments are scattered over the United States from Columbia to Stanford. They include all six of the departments in which it is now possible to earn a doctor's degree in this field. I have such registration tabulated for seven semesters including the current semester, i.e., from the autumn of 1930 to the first semester of the present year, both inclusive.

Contrary to what many people believed, and perhaps to what most of you have believed, this graduate registration in speech shows a substantial increase in these seven semesters of depression years. The totals of this graduate registration in speech for the seven semesters run as follows: 294, 312, 338, 349, 387, 390, 414. The striking fact is that in the seven semesters such graduate registration in the field of Speech in eleven universities rose from 294 to 414. There is one department in this list which has registered this semester more graduate students in speech than there were members of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION eighteen years ago. Our total membership at that time was 156; this semester there are registered at Columbia University 163 graduate students in speech. There are registered this semester in the six departments of Columbia, Cornell, Michigan,

Wisconsin, Iowa and Louisiana, sixty-six candidates for the doctor's degree.

The figures which I have just given you can, of course, be interpreted to mean many things. May I mention a few of the things which these figures mean to me? They mean that in spite of the hardships which have come in these years to many departments and to many teachers, there are hundreds of men and women who still have sufficient faith in the future of this work to invest precious years, and more or less precious money, in preparation for professional careers in our work. Some of you may think that they are ill advised, and are making a questionable investment of time and money, and surely none of us can know with certainty what the returns on this investment will be. I suppose that no one who has lived through the last four years as a mature and responsible person will ever again feel very certain about the future returns on any investment of a material sort. Far be it from me to suggest that this profession or that this ASSOCIATION, speaking in a sense for the profession, should in any way undertake to guarantee deposits or to insure a reasonable return on the time and money spent toady in gaining better professional preparation. Obviously, we should not and cannot do anything like that, either as a national organization or as individual teachers or administrators in our various colleges and universities. But what we can do and what we must do, if we are not to play the part of charlatans, is to attempt everything in our power, individually and collectively, to see to it that the programs prescribed and the standards set are such that our graduates,—our future teachers,—go out from our colleges and universities with qualifications that are more than labels, with credentials that are something more than nicely formulated papers, or even sheepskins upon which are to be found the autographs of various educational administrators.

These are times for the raising of standards and for the sorting and selecting of graduate students with greater care than ever before. We must realize that the rewards of activity in this field are still good enough to attract the bluffer, and the quack. We still have to contend with the importunities of the unfit and with the wiles of those who prefer short cuts, and trickery to hard work, scholarship, competence, and even ordinary honesty. Surrender to these camp followers of our profession, by this association, by any of the affiliated associations, or by individuals, will be fatal. If the alternative is a fight—either on the scale of a skirmish or of a war—what of it? We

must uphold decent standards in our work or quit—that is all of us who are blessed or cursed with self-respect. In the long run there are no alternatives for us either as individual teachers or as a profession.

We must be much more rigid in issuing and accepting credentials of all kinds. The outlook seems to me rather gloomy for the holders of shoddy, friendly, and purely autobiographical credentials. When we were a frontier community in education, the freedom and the traditional hospitality of the frontier often carried the day over the best of principles and precedents. But we are no longer a frontier community. In our professional future as I see it there is going to be little or no place for the unqualified, the half qualified, the disqualified.

Of course it is true that, ideally, credentials have always had to mean something more than somebody's name on the dotted line, and they have always been supposed to get their essential weight from the standing and standards of the institution or the individual whose authority they carried. Granting all this, I still believe that we are now in a period, which is going to last for some time, in which two factors will be present which were not, in so marked a degree, present in the last two decades. The first is, that the relation of supply to demand, in the open market for teachers of speech, has greatly changed. We have recently been, and we are now, producing in teacher training departments more teachers than can be employed in the regular course of events as we have known them. What is to be done? I suppose that we cannot seek a solution through a code under the N.R.A. We cannot very well plow under our graduates nor slaughter them to feed the poor. The outlook, however, does not seem to me to be entirely hopeless.

The first essential of a recovery program is to realize that we are now entering a period of much closer scrutiny of credentials, and whatever is behind them, than we have known in our days of rapid expansion. The best credentials, and the best training, in comparison with the good, or those that are not so good, are going to be demanded as never before.

Next, and even of greater importance, it seems clear that in the years that lie just ahead credentials of teachers in this field are going to be more and more subjected to evaluation by educators whose training and professional interest has not been primarily in the speech field as we have known it. In other words, our graduate degrees, our diplomas, our recommendations, and other professional creden-

tials are going to have to be, in a sense, more negotiable, more subject to the market conditions in the great Stock Exchange of general education. They are going to be passed upon and evaluated, accepted or rejected, much more in the future, by educational administrators who want certain things done in education, and who are not heads of established departments of speech who are simply looking for additional members for the staff of rapidly growing departments. Departments of speech and other departments have been eliminated in these years of depression, and I believe that there is small ground for hoping that in the next decade the number of departments of speech will so increase as to absorb readily the crops of M.A.'s and the Ph.D.'s that will be turned out in this field. Any such increase in departments would have to come largely in the schools below the college grade. I see nothing in the financial outlook, or in the outlook in modern curriculum planning, to warrant any expectation of a large and rapid growth in departments of speech in High Schools; and of course there is little strict departmentalization in the grades below the high school level.

The 414 graduate students in speech registered this semester in eleven universities, constitute only a part of the country's total. Just what the total is, no one knows. If we judge the near future by the immediate past, we must expect this number to mount up with each semester of each year. To some this may seem a hopeless situation. I think that we shall probably all grant that anyone could justify the opinion that there simply are not going to be positions for those students—that they are making investments in time and money on which they will never get any adequate return. However, that is not my opinion. We are here frankly in the realm of personal opinion and prophecy. I realize of course that anyone else has as much right to essay the role of prophet as I have; but since I accepted President Bassett's invitation to discuss this subject, probably I should give you my opinion at this point and my reasons for it.

I have already suggested that I think we should now raise our standards, discourage and refuse degrees and recommendations to the lower strata of graduate students, and weed out the unqualified and the unfit from the present ranks of teachers (with, of course, due regard for long tenure, age, and other relevant considerations). This is being done in other fields. We should do it for the protection of the future work in this field and as part of our obligation to education. If this is done to a reasonable extent, I believe that the well-prepared, the really competent, can find plenty of employment in the near future.

I have had one "strand of experience" in the last four years which has been quite illuminating, and which colors all of my thought on this particular aspect of our professional outlook. About four years ago, when the National Council of teachers of English set up the machinery for a Curriculum Survey Commission to study the English curriculum from the kindergarten through the graduate school, the officers of the English Council asked various other organizations to set up Advisory Committees to assist them in their work along the lines of the interest and activity of such other organizations. This happened in President John Dolman's administration, and President Dolman asked me to accept the chairmanship of the Advisory Committee set up in this ASSOCIATION. I accepted the appointment gladly, and have been greatly interested in this project ever since. Something over three years ago the chairman of the Curriculum Commission, Dr. Hatfield, of Chicago, the editor of the *English Journal*, asked me to take a place on the Steering Committee of the Commission, which is the Committee that makes all the final decisions and which will eventually publish the complete report. In the last three years I have attended meetings of the Steering Committee in Cleveland, Washington, Milwaukee, and Detroit. I have been impressed with two things which have seemed to me to stand out in the deliberations of this Committee: First, are the great potentialities in this activity in regard to the future of the members of our profession, and Second, the strong sympathy with, the cordial desire for, the promotion of sound work in speech wherever the work in speech and the work in English seem to have common ground or common problems. There is no doubt whatever in my mind about the cordial support of the leaders of this movement in the English Council for the things which I believe most of you stand for in education. I know it was not always thus: today, however, the leaders of the English Council in the work of the Curriculum Commission are showing a cordiality for, and an endorsement of, the better work in our field to a degree that many of us years ago would not have considered possible.

I well remember our differences with some of the leaders of the English Council eighteen or nineteen years ago. I can almost say that those were difficulties "all of which I saw and part of which I was." But those days with their problems and prejudices are dead. Today we are asked sincerely and cordially to co-operate in an enterprise of educational planning that should appeal to all realists among us.

The work of the English Curriculum Commission is not yet

finished. In fact, we are just now entering the final stage of assembling, editing, and coördinating the work of a large number of committees. It will be perhaps a year, perhaps two, before the final report of the Commission is published. In the first stage of the work, the votes that have been taken and the opinions expressed in the Steering Committee indicate that the Commission will make substantially no recommendations specifically affecting speech curricula in regular college, university, and professional school work. But it seems almost certain that the Commission will make recommendations of great importance to teachers of speech concerning work in the preparation of grade and high school teachers wherever such teacher training work may be found.

This last follows from the fact that the Curriculum Commission envisages the normal or typical situation in the grades and high schools as one in which an entirely separate department of speech does not exist. They believe that the typical, normal situation will be one in which whatever speech work is done will almost inevitably be done either by some specialist in speech correction working probably out of a central speech clinic which serves a whole system, or a group of schools, or else will be done by teachers engaged to handle together all English and speech work.

Of course, there is nothing at all in the thinking of the Commission which precludes the possibility of some specialization among the teachers in the grades and high schools so that perhaps one so-called English teacher may give her time exclusively to literature, another exclusively to composition, and another exclusively to speech training. The essential point is, that the Curriculum Commission hopes to present a report which will cover substantially all of whatever speech work is likely to be done in grades and high schools in the immediate future. I think it is correct to say that the Steering Committee would say with substantial unanimity that to them this seems the inevitable situation regardless of what anyone might ideally or theoretically desire—that to debate today as to whether or not this ought to be true would be wholly futile. In this attitude I believe that the Commission is thoroughly realistic. I believe no other attitude can be realistic when one considers the school system of the United States as a whole. There is, of course, nothing whatever in this inimical to the existence of present, or to-be-established separate and independent departments of speech in high schools that are large enough and fortunate enough in many ways to afford such departmentalization.

Along with the attitude of the Commission which I have just expressed goes another attitude which it is necessary for all teachers of speech to hold in mind when they react to, or evaluate in any way, the view of the English Commission that essentially, by and large, speech and English must be considered together in grades and high schools. That is this: The leaders of the Curriculum Commission believe that at the present time there are relatively few English teachers who are competent to handle the speech work that should be given in the grades and high schools. I think that I report accurately what is at present the substantially unanimous opinion of the Steering Committee (though we have had no vote on this proposition) that the great body of English teachers today are not at all prepared to do the speech work that should be done.

It seems to me to follow logically from these statements that if the plans and purposes of the Steering Committee of the Curriculum Commission are ever put into general practice in the United States, they will create a tremendous demand for trained teachers of speech to take positions in English departments and on English budgets in the school systems of the country. They will further create an equally great demand for the education or the re-education of English teachers in general in the field of speech. It follows from this, I believe, that the part of the Commission report on teacher training will probably be, for us teachers of speech, the most interesting and important part of that report. While I am not technically a member of the Curriculum Commission's Committee on teacher training, I have, for some years past, been invited to sit with that Committee in its meetings, and I can assure you that that Committee seems, on all points that I have just mentioned, quite at one with the members of the Steering Committee.

Now, in sum, what does this undertaking of the English Council mean today to the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH? Doubtless, in some of its aspects it means different things to different individuals, but I hope that it will mean, to most of us, recognition of the importance of this movement to the future of our profession. I trust that you will remember that a few moments ago I said, in indulging in what may strike some of you as rather optimistic prophecies, "*if* the best thinking of the Steering Committee is ever made largely effective in the educational system of the United States"—I know, and the other members of the Steering Committee know, that that is a big "if,"—We cannot tell what perils lie ahead of education in the United States today. We cannot tell what exigencies

of financial distress for the population as a whole, or what stupidities of taxation, what political blindnesses, what governmental inefficiency may rise to thwart the best laid plans. Perhaps the report of the Commission will have little or no effect. It may be presented in a time of greater distress than the present. It may be given to a world more topsy-turvy than that of 1933. If and when it comes out, you may be vitally concerned with matters that will make the problems of curriculum planning seem trivial indeed. I do not want you to think that I believe that the concerns of this Commission are the chief problems before humanity today. But I do believe that they are of great importance among the problems with which this association has to deal. If the recommendations of the Curriculum Commission bear little or no fruit, I trust that it will not be due, in any measure, to the fact that they will have fallen among the thistles of our indifference or disapproval. I trust that when the report is published it will command the respect and approval of the great body of teachers of Speech as well as of teachers of English.

I hope this undertaking of the English Council just now may mean to us primarily a great opportunity for cordial cooperation to the end that more speech training, and more intelligent speech training may be available in the future to hundreds of thousands of American school children than is the case today. It seems to me that we ought to consider this whole movement as an offer of power and influence to promote *our proper purposes* in education. We ought to look upon it essentially as a sincere and cordial offer of reinforcements brought up and *offered* at a critical moment when reinforcements should be very welcome. We should look upon it, further, not as an offer of help from an alien army, which the juggling of diplomacy has thrown upon our side, but rather as an offer to us of an opportunity to work with a sincere and convinced and friendly force who literally sees our objectives as partly theirs also, and who ask only that we all work together for ends which are, or ought to be, of great importance, not only to all teachers of speech and to all teachers of English, but to all people who are interested in sound education, and in what sound education can do to and for maturing humanity.

There is one aspect of our professional outlook today in connection with graduate work which seems to me ludicrously out of keeping with the size and power of our NATIONAL ASSOCIATION and with growth and development of our graduate work as evidenced by the figures which I have just given. That is the paucity of our scholarly

publishing. The publications of our ASSOCIATION seem to me to be too much what they were eighteen years ago when we were an association of 200 instead of an association of over 1600 members as we are today. Our publications seem to me not to have grown or changed in the way in which they should have grown and changed as our graduate work and our research has developed.[1] In the last twelve years, five universities have granted doctors' degrees in this field to 38 men and women. Hundreds of masters' degrees have been granted to graduate students many of whom have done scholarly work of high grade. This work has resulted in seminar papers and theses that have been highly commended, not only by scholars in this field but also by scholars in other fields who have become acquainted with these writings. In one way it is true that much of this work should be published whether it is good or bad. It should be submitted to the professional public. The profession as a whole should know how good, or how poor, it actually is. It seems to me that our Association has been remiss in the contribution that it has made to the task of getting out such publications, the task of making the results of scholarly work available to the teachers and students in this field and of the educational world in general. Recently, four professors in the Department of Speech in the University of Iowa, in starting *The Archives of Speech,* have taken a great step forward in this respect. Perhaps men in other universities will follow this high example, but if they do, while it will doubtless help to solve the problem, it will not, it seems to me, in any way absolve this Association from its failure to make its proper contribution to the solution. We should, *as an association,* do something more than we have done in promoting scholarly publishing in our field. We should not be content with a publishing program that is altogether too nearly identical with the publishing program we had when our membership was one-eighth of what it is at the present time. This is of course not a criticism of any administration, any president, any editor, or any other official. It is simply an attempt to point out one respect in which our professional outlook seems to me sadly in need of repair. Our outlook would seem to me much more promising if it envisaged a vigorous and fruitful program of scholarly publishing.

One more thought, and I am done: Eighteen years ago, at our first Convention, I referred to the unity of our field; to the pro-

[1] [Editor's Note. In the year that has passed since Professor O'Neill spoke, the first number of *Speech Monographs,* the ASSOCIATION'S publication of research studies, has appeared.]

fessional solidarity, the *esprit de corps,* which seemed to me then to have been somewhat achieved, by the fact of our national organization, and the publication of our official organ. The growth and development of the last eighteen years has been tremendous and the fruits of it have, I am sure, been gratifying to every person who worked on those early foundations. But the growth has been so great and the specialization which was, eighteen years ago, and which still is, one of the outstanding needs of our profession, has been so marked in the last few years that today, in the professional outlook, I see disturbing signs of disintegration and disunion. It seems to me that, in our professional activity, as in so many other types of activity, we should all believe that "in union there is strength." We should not only believe in united professional activity, but we should so organize our professional enterprise as to insure unity of effort. Whatever our field of specialization is, whether our scholarly and professional interest is primarily in rhetoric and public speaking, or in phonetics and voice science, or in the theater arts, or in speech disorders, or in interpretations and oral reading, or in psychology and pedagogy, we should first of all be professionally teachers of Speech, united with, and loyal to, the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH. In the organization and administration of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, and in the organization and administration of any and all specialized groups within our field, whether the Theater Conference or the American Society for the Study of Speech Disorders, much of value can be gained, and nothing of value can be lost, by close and harmonious integration. I trust that we are not on the threshold of a period of secession, with or without revolutionary or civil wars. If the disasters of such an epoch are to be avoided, it seems to me that our proper outlook must take in at once the just recognition of the special interests of all our special groups. We must, in the government of NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, accept the principle that has been accepted in political organizations for centuries, and for many years in scholarly and professional organizations of large size and diversified concerns; namely, the principle of representative government. There has been a tendency in the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION for the last few years to move away from the principle of pure democracy and the machinery of the town meeting, to the principle of representative democracy and the machinery of federated government. I believe that that tendency should be accepted and accelerated.

To me, our Professional Outlook must inevitably lose something

of whatever of rosy optimism we can discern today unless the responsible government of this Association, and of the special organizations within the field, move rapidly toward fair, complete, and cordial integration, with the ideals of democratic control definitely accepted and provided for, in a complete and orderly federal government based upon the principle of responsible representation. Ladies and gentlemen, these are the more significant aspects of the professional outlook as I see it today. It seems to me to have an interesting variety of light and shade, of satisfying vistas and challenging difficulties. I seem to see both rosy tinted clouds and thunder caps; there are hnits of silver linings and fragments of rainbows. In fact, there are plenty of good excuses for either pointing with pride or viewing with alarm according to your pet philosophy of life.

I have had one comment, however, on this speech to which I wish to offer an amendment in closing. When I wrote to Professor Winans that I was to address you on this topic, instead of writing back that President Bassett had made a fine selection, and that he was looking forward keenly to hearing my views on this subject, he wrote merely: "Well, it would take an incorrigible optimist." I cannot accept that label without protest. I may at times be something less than hopelessly despondent; I may, when circumstances seem to require it, be able to make myself believe that "in the mud and scum of things, there alway, alway, something sings." I am even willing to admit this much and say that I am glad of it. There have been times when the mud and scum with which I have had to contend in my labors in the vineyard, have been so painfully evident both to sight and smell that I have needed something more than my poor ear for music in order to keep my mind on the tunes. If this be optimism, make the most of it. But I am not incorrigible. I move to amend by substitution. I offer the word "dirigible." I am willing to plead guilty to being a dirigible optimist,—one who has complete confidence in the future *provided* we are directed by facts. If courses can be charted, and decisions made, that square with facts, then the future has no terrors. Its problems can all be solved, its difficulties overcome. I invite you to look forward confidently in the only spirit that ever has successfully solved problems or guided campaigns,—the spirit of the dirigible optimist.

FUNDAMENTAL OBJECTIVES OF A TEACHER OF SPEECH IN 1935

LEE NORVELLE
Indiana University

THE points of view expressed here are of a purely personal nature and come as a result of experiences in teaching speech to university and extension classes. The writer realizes that the majority of speech teachers are agreed upon certain objectives and certain methods of class-room procedure. Some of the following ideas will, it is hoped, coincide with those agreed upon and adopted by the majority. Others must, of necessity, be subjected to critical evaluation because they run counter to the accepted order. The infallibility of accepting all that which meets with majority approval or rejecting any part of it for the same reason becomes immediately apparent.

Into the writer's extension speech classes each year come men and women from various occupations. Many of them are business executives holding responsible positions. Others are well established in their respective fields of law, medicine, teaching, engineering, dentistry, selling, etc. At the first meeting of each semester the new members are asked to state specifically why they wish to take a course in beginning speech. The answer is, "Because I need it in my work." Many state that they underestimated the value of speech training or entirely neglected it while attending college. Others state that the speech work which they did take while in college was not properly adapted to their needs.

The purpose of this paper is to re-evaluate the objectives of a teacher of speech in terms of present day needs. The treatment deals with the general purposes of the entire field rather than with any one of its specific divisions, such as public speaking, dramatics, debating, oral reading, etc. It is hoped that the objectives presented will be applicable in a certain degree to all of these specific divisions.

In the re-evaluation of the entire educational field it is but natural that each division of that field be scrutinized minutely. The question is being asked of all teachers, "What justification is there for continuing the particular courses which you offer?" In some instances the answer is supplied by the questioner without an opportunity on the part of the questioned to reply. But suppose a teacher of speech is given the opportunity—and I use the word "opportunity"

advisedly, believing that is exactly what it would be considered to be by any intelligent, well-trained, energetic and enthusiastic speech teacher—to defend the existence of his field in the light of present conditions.

The first step in the analysis would be to answer that ever perplexing question, "What is the fundamental purpose of all college training?" As limited and familiar as the following answer may seem, it is at least adequate for this discussion: "To gather subject material which will provide a background for needs after college and to develop habits which will enable the individual to adapt himself adequately to the cultural, social, economic, spiritual, and political demands of his generation." Now let us see if training in speech brings to the student sufficient content and practical training, as measured by this fundamental purpose, to justify its continued existence.

W. I. Early[1] gives the results of a questionnaire sent to two hundred college teachers asking them to name the "three most valuable traits in a beginning university student." Out of sixty-five qualities named the ten receiving a comparatively outstanding number of votes in order are:

1. Industry
2. Intelligence
3. Having a worthy objective
4. Desire to learn
5. Intellectual curiosity
6. Ambition
7. Intellectual honesty
8. Will power
9. Study habits
10. Initiative

Out of a possible six hundred votes scholarship received but seven. This seems significant, particularly so when we consider that the votes were cast by college professors. Perhaps the lack of uniformity in determining grades and the wide range of variables are responsible; or perhaps it was thought that if the individual possessed the ten traits listed above his scholarship would be assured.

The curriculum of yesterday consisted primarily of Greek, Latin, mathematics, and philosophy. These subjects were favored because they could be taught from the point of view of mental discipline. Later came "practical education." This meant that the art of knowl-

[1] Early, W. I., "Retrospect and Outlook" *North Central Association Quarterly*, September, 1929, p. 191.

edge was emphasized as well as was the science of knowledge. Science—to know; art—to do. In many instances during and following the transitional period the pendulum swung too far toward doing with the result that much of the work offered in colleges and universities was little more than the equivalent of that done in trade schools. The general aim of today is well expressed in the following, "An aim of education that seems consistent with the postulations of modern philosophy is life-enrichment through participation in a democratic school order."[2] Now let us see how the objectives of speech training as they are taught in 1934 contribute materially to "Life enrichment through participation in a democratic school order." The reader may question the existence of "A democratic social order"; however, he will not, I believe, question the desirability of such a state. Should we admit the non-existence of such an order and grant its desirability, the objectives would be practically the same as far as speech training is concerned, for many of those factors which would contribute to the existence of the order would, of necessity, function in bringing about its origin and evolution.

Life-enrichment depends primarily upon the exchanging of ideas and the majority of ideas are exchanged through the use of articulate sounds. Consequently any training which contributes specifically to this end can be justified.

The first objective of speech training is that of *evaluating and correlating materials contacted* in various individual experiences, especially those experiences resulting from a series of prescribed courses in college. These courses, theoretically at least, it is thought, constitute a body of knowledge which has been mastered. Actually I believe it may mean far less. The degree of mastery is best determined by the individual's ability to function at the moment of need and in the most efficient manner. Inability to do so has been primarily responsible for the attitude of employers, in most fields, to look askance upon college graduates seeking employment. It was this condition which brought about the change in the curriculum which gave emphasis to doing as well as to knowing.

The second objective of speech training is to improve the individual's ability to *think out loud*. In the final analysis speech is nothing more than thinking out loud. No one will, I believe, question the value of any educational program which has for its objective,

[2] Report of a Committee on Science Teaching, published in the 1932 *Yearbook* of the National Society for the Study of Education.

and reaches it to a perceptible degree, that of improving thought. One of the decided advantages of speech training is that the individual's progress can be measured more definitely than can his progress in most other fields. Courses in speech are the only ones where major emphasis is placed upon thinking out loud. In many courses the student spends practically all of his time receiving information from silent reading and from listening to lectures. Some of this he attempts to reproduce in writing during the periods devoted to examinations. But rarely does he have the opportunity of presenting his ideas to a group of persons and of getting from them their reaction to him as a thinking, socialized human being. The result of this lack of training is that he finds it extremely difficult to express himself well before groups when conditions necessitate. Why shouldn't the college course which he has pursued for four years provide him with this type of training? The college does insist upon his acquiring enough skill in writing to pass four semester's work in composition, and in many instances he is required to pass a proficiency test in writing. How about his proficiency in speaking? Which is used more? Which is the more difficult? Why is it that many students can write on "A" theme and yet fail when asked to present the content of that same theme orally? Is there sufficient transfer of learning from graphic to oral expression to justify the omission of the latter? The answers to these questions are obvious. This is in no way an attempt to depreciate the value of training in graphic expression but rather to call attention to the need of developing a technique which is a very definite part of practically every successful person's equipment. To be able to arise and say what one wishes to say in the manner he wishes to say it and at the time he wishes to say it is most satisfying and beneficial. It is an experience seldom enjoyed by the most cultivated of our species. All training which brings the college student nearer to this goal certainly is highly beneficial.

The third definite objective of speech training is that of enabling the student to *develop* and *control* his *emotions*. It is unfortunate that the present plan of education offers so little in the way of providing specific training for the individual's emotional life. Practically all of his training is designed to help him with his reasoning. Yet in the final analysis we find that most of our reactions are determined more by emotional factors than by reasoning. In speaking effectively a person must be both intellectually and emotionally responsive. The unemotional speaker is an uninteresting speaker.

The speaker who does not properly control his emotions is a pathetic speaker. It is the stirred up and the controlled condition of the organism which gives vitality to the speaker. We speak not to transfer ideas to others but rather to stir up meanings within them. Speech is primarily a socializing factor and it is the emotional element which determines the degree of pleasantness of the speech situation. It is also the emotional element which reveals the reader's appreciation of the literature which he reads aloud. The speaker reveals the height of his ideal, the depth of his conviction, and the breadth of his human interests and sympathies through his emotional responses. To speak effectively is to think clearly and feel deeply, always controlling, not suppressing, the emotion with the thought.

The fourth objective of speech training is that of developing the student's *will power*. Maximum proficiency in speaking effectively comes as a result of supreme effort. The contention that maximum development is possible only when there is a *will* to improve is well supported in various fields of acquisition and learning. In summarizing the results of their study of learning the telegraphic language, Bryan and Harter[3] state, "That in learning to interpret the telegraphic language, it is intense effort that educates . . . Every step in advance seems to cost as much as the former."

Meuman[4] in his extensive study of learning to memorize states "that every advance in mental or bodily skill which results from practice is in the last analysis a phenomenon of will."

Thorndike[5] in discussing the rate and amount of improvement in learning states, "The main reason why we write slowly and illegibly, add slowly with frequent errors, delay answers to simple questions . . . is that we are not doing the best we can in that particular field. It is that we have too many other improvements to make, or do not know how to direct our practice, or do not *really care* enough about the improvement, or some mixture of these conditions."

No one questions the value of training which demands, within certain limits, that the student exert himself more on each successive step. Many of us who teach undergraduate courses and especially those of us who teach speech are often prone to be satisfied with mediocrity. If the student is fairly energetic, reasonably fluent,

[3] Bryan and Harter, "Studies in the Physiology and Psychology of the Telegraphic Language," *Psychological Review*, IV (1897), 50.

[4] Meuman, E. "Economie and Technique des Lernens," *Archive fur die Gesamte Psychologie*, IV, 1-232.

[5] Thorndike, E. L., *Educational Psychology*, II, 178 ff.

averagely intelligent, and responds to each speech situation, we pass him even though he has made little or no improvement in his ability to speak more effectively. How many times do we insist upon such a student making a supreme effort to improve? Isn't that the only way in which we can expect maximum improvement from each member of our classes? When this is done there will be a definite carry-over of learning from this to other forms of acquisition.

Through the use of a rating form for the determining of the student's ability to speak effectively and also for determining his rate of improvement we have greatly increased the value of work given in the fundamental speech course here at Indiana. The student is required to put forth a supreme effort on each speech. The results have been most gratifying. In addition to improving his ability as a speaker he also gains much in mental discipline by developing his will power.

The fifth objective is that of enabling the student to get adequate *control* of his *vocal apparatus*. There is a very definite need for this type of training throughout the entire school systems of the United States. It is regrettable that in a system of education where so much emphasis is placed upon preparing the individual for adequate adaptation to a social democratic order there is no standard required for proficiency in using his voice—the chief medium through which he expresses most of his ideas. Charles Sears Baldwin[6] stated the situation clearly when he said that "The United States is the only civilized country where social and intellectual standing cannot be told by the voice quality of the speaker. Some of the most erudite men and best dressed women in America use voice tones of which a scratched disc or a rusty phonograph would be ashamed." In a class in speech training for teachers here at Indiana University this summer, fifteen out of twenty-four were rated as having voice characteristics which would greatly interfere with their proficiency as teachers. These ratings were made by the members of the class who stated that they would not wish to be subjected to the necessity of listening to these persons speak for even a short period of time. A majority of the fifteen are teachers who have had from one to twelve years of teaching experience.

One can readily understand the continuous influx of students who have bad voices, to institutions of higher learning when grade

[6] "Pussy Willow English," Editorial, *Saturday Review of Literature*, June 16, 1934.

and high school teachers themselves have disagreeable voice characteristics. Unfortunately these characteristics are not confined to grade and high school teachers. Colleges and universities have many such. All departments of higher learning and especially schools of education which have the responsibility of formulating the teacher training curriculum, should insist upon the student's overcoming those voice characteristics which attract unfavorable attention to the delivery of ideas rather than favorable attention to the ideas themselves. The worst part of an unpleasant voice is not the auditory effect which it has upon the listener, but it robs the content of what is being said of much of its favorable attention value. This condition should not be tolerated in any school system. If speech training had nothing more than the developing of good voice characteristics to offer it would be of considerable value.

The sixth objective of speech training is that of enabling the student to *develop* an *appreciation* of the *best types of literature*—the literature of power: poetry, dramatic dialogue and certain types of prose. There is unquestionably a body of literature which must be dealt with orally in order to be understood and appreciated as the writers intended that it should be. Too often one hears a teacher of literature lecture at great length on the meaning and beauty of certain selections but when that same teacher reads the selections, utter boredom is the inevitable result. The student immediately draws one of two obvious conclusions: either that the selections so highly praised were greatly over-evaluated; or that the teacher has not developed the proper technique for making clear the meaning or revealing the depth of his own appreciation of the selections. Certainly no one should be licensed to teach English Literature in any form without first demonstrating his ability to read all types of literature intelligently, appreciatively and pleasingly. This procedure would result in the development of a much greater appreciation on the part of students for all the better types of literature, a condition which certainly would contribute greatly to the enrichment of the individual's life. No one can fully substantiate his claim to being educated and cultured until he can read well. Oral reading is one of the simplest and best of all the intelligence tests yet devised in or out of the psychological fold.

There are many other objectives which might be pointed out if space permitted, but if the foregoing are made a definite part of the speech teacher's contribution there will be little to fear in the way of justifying the existence of his course to the most critical investi-

gating committee. Our work is constantly being evaluated, and why not? Any progressive system of education takes into consideration what is being done by its different departments. As a result those departments making worth while contributions are placed on the credit side of the educational ledger. "The weakest fruit drops earliest to the ground," and why not? Fortunately the Shavian theory "That those who can, do, and those who can't, teach," has been disproved during the last four years. Some of those "who teach" have been called upon to fill important positions in the reconstruction programs. Many of those "who can't teach" have been eliminated and replaced by those who can. The pruning-hook is being exercised in the pedagogical orchard, and why not?

As teachers of a very important subject let us discharge our responsibility rather than shift it, as is so amusingly done in the following illustration:

The College President:[7]
Such rawness in a student is a shame,
But lack of preparation is the blame.
The High School Principal:
Good Heavens! What crudity! The boy's a fool.
The fault of course is with the grammar school.
The Grammar Principal:
Would that from such a dunce I might be spared!
They send them up to me so unprepared.
The Primary Teacher:
Poor Kindergarten blockhead! And they call
That "Preparation." Worse than none at all.
The Kindergarten Teacher:
Never such a lack of training did I see!
What sort of person can the mother be?
The Mother:
You stupid child! But then, you're not to blame;
Your father's family are all the same.

Wherever speech training is "weak fruit" it is weak by nurture rather than by nature for fundamentally it has as much to offer in both art and science as has any other subject in the curriculum and more than most. I do not mean to say that all speech training is good. I do say that it can be made good by the right kind of teacher. The teacher is judged by the products he turns out at the end of the semester, year, or four year period no less than is a producer in any other field judged by his product. And why shouldn't it be so?

[7] Early, W. L., *op. cit.*, p. 189.

If our objectives as teachers of speech, include helping students to develop and correlate a body of knowledge, to develop a method of clear thinking, and to form habits and attitudes which will enable them to express themselves effectively, and consequently make it easier for them to participate adequately in a democratic social order, we shall deem it an opportunity to justify our work in any educational program that is worth while.

MEASUREMENTS IN CONTEST SPEAKING

RICHARD N. THOMPSON
San Diego Army and Navy Academy

MEASUREMENT in the field of public speaking has been a professional hobby of the author for a period now exceeding ten years. His first interest was confined to an attempt to measure the intelligence of high-school debaters.[1] After a three-year period of study, he discovered that the nation-wide data which he had assembled indicated that those who achieved consistent success in debating were generally of better than average intelligence. From that time on, he has consistently refused to admit to any forensic group any student whose I.Q. was much under 115, except for experimental purposes.

It will be evident from the foregoing that the objective has been to produce teams which would give promise of developing better than average public speakers. For years this measurement was confined to debaters, primarily seeking to discover the intellectual bases for debating talent, and resulting in the discovery that all types of public speaking required a certain foundation of intelligence.

This present article takes up a different phase of measurement attempting to set out a method which will measure at any given time in the forensic season what any single individual or the entire squad has accomplished in public speaking, excluding debating. (At the close of the present article, an attempt will be made to show how debating results may be included in this tabulated summary.)

Let us imagine, for example, that an early season squad is composed of about five individuals, in order to make the calculations fairly simple and understandable. Let us use actual names and accomplishments in successive contests to show how the system

[1] "The Intelligence of High School Debaters," *Q. J. S.*, XVII (1931), 403.

works. Five students constitute the early season squad in this instance, although we have had from six to thirty during other seasons.

The first contest is a declamation contest against school G. There are three contestants from each school, making a total of six. Let us represent first place, or the highest number of points which could be won by an individual by a number equal to the number of students competing, or six. The student taking second place will then receive one less point, or five, and so on successively down to last place which will be represented by one point.

In this contest, Edwards won first place, Stotsky third place, and Park, to whom this type of contest was new, last place. The other places were won by students from the competing school. Using our point system, we find that out of a total of six possible points which might be won by any one individual, Edwards has won 6, or six-sixths; Stotsky 4 or four-sixths; and Park has secured 1 or one-sixth.

Reducing these fractions to decimals on the basis of 1000 as in the familiar example of a batting average, we have Edwards with an average of 1000; Stotsky with .667 and Park with .167. To see whether this team as a unit has done a better job than its rivals, you have but to divide the total (1834) by three, and if the result exceeds 500, your squad up to date is succeeding. In this case the resulting score is .611.

The next contest was a three-cornered one of an extemporaneous type against schools G and S. In this case there were three speakers from three schools or a total of nine contestants, giving first place a value of nine points, second place counting eight, and so on successively in decreasing ratio. Edwards in this contest won second place, scoring 8 out of a possible total of nine points, or eight-ninths or 889. Stotsky took fourth place, scoring 6 points, or six-ninths or 667, while Guajardo took seventh place, scoring 3 points, or three-ninths or .333. Once more totalling the figures for each, we have a team total of 1889, which divided by 3 gives us a team score of .630, once more better than average. By adding the score of the first contest, .611, and that of the second, .630, we find the average for the two contests to be .620, still ahead of average results.

In measuring the accomplishments of the four students who have been used thus far in forensic competition, we have individual scores as follows: Edwards .944; Stotsky .667; Guajardo .333; Park, .167. In administering a public-speaking group of this type, if I did not know from a former year's experience with the two students whose point ratios are lowest that they had done splendid work in other

forms of public speaking, notably debate, I would postpone using them until later, and it will be noticed that in this case I did so in the particular kind of contest in which they had proved themselves less able. Of course it must always be borne in mind in judging any individual that an accurate judgment can hardly be made on less than three contests, but if one is working for a victorious season, it is generally wise to utilize those of your team or squad who have shown the best ratios and experiment with a change in the third individual on your team.

The third contest to be included in our summary was less favorable to our school. It was a contest against schools S and G in extempore speaking. Once more we had a total of nine speakers divided between the three schools. The best any speaker on our team could do in this contest was a fourth place which was secured by Edwards, with 6 points out of a possible 9, or .667. Mullen, a new man, took fifth place with 5 points out of 9, or .555. Stotsky took this time an eighth place, scoring but two points, or .222. Totalling these points and dividing by three, we find the team score to be .481, the first time in the year when it fell below average. The average score for the three contests to date is, however, .574.

A study of individual averages reveals the following data: Edwards' score in three contests .852; Stotsky's score, despite his poor showing in the last contest, is still a good one, .519. These two students have shown by their consistent work that they can be relied upon to make a better than average score on a series of contests and will constitute an excellent nucleus around which experimentation with other students can safely be made. As long as the team average remains above 500, one can experiment quite freely, but when it drops below that point, experimentation should stop temporarily and the best talent available be used until a better than average score has once more been reached.

The fourth contest was a series of declaimed orations. Edwards, being used at the time in a dramatic rehearsal, was not available. Stotsky showed that his placement in the previous contest was accidental by bringing in a first place out of nine students, with an individual score of 1000. Pendleton was sixth with .444; Hall came seventh with .333. The team score, thanks to Stotsky, was .592. The average to that date for all contests was .579.

The fifth contest was like the fourth in nature, but less restricted as to declamation, and between two schools only. Pendleton justified my judgment in picking him for a second try by obtaining first place out of six. Stotsky's ranking by the judge was a tie for second

place. In working out this tie for scoring purposes, second and third place were reduced to decimal ratio (.833 and .667 respectively) and the sum divided. Stotsky was thus awarded .750, even though in tossing a coin for the place for resolving the tie, he won the toss. Hall secured a point ratio of .167. The total for the five contests, this one giving a team average of .639, is thus .591, a very fair record.

By the use of a minimum I.Q. of 115 and the measuring-method herein referred to, I have never had a team average of less than .500 in any one season, and generally much better than that.

The measurement of debating is much more difficult and should be kept in a different summary than other forensic encounters, because of the fact that it is extremely difficult to figure which member or members of a debate team contributed to the wins and losses of the team, and in what proportion. There is only one way in which it can be reasonably approximated and that is by the results over a period of time. It will normally take from three to four debates to average out in such a way as to be fair to those contending in debates. Obviously if the coach has come to the conclusion that a certain debater or debaters are principally responsible for losing one or more debates, and when he has removed them, the team wins consistently, it would seem evident that he has figured their responsibility correctly.

In debating, I have felt that when a team wins, each member of the team should score .750. Those of us who have coached, judged, and witnessed hundreds of such contests know that rarely is a team so overwhelmingly the victor that it should be accorded all the points and its opponents' work go completely for naught. Thus .750 is awarded to each member of a winning team, making the team average likewise .750. This leaves .250 for the losing team. This method of calculation not only enables a team which loses one debate and wins the next to have a .500 average, but also ties in with a 500-point award to a non-decision team, and comes surprisingly near to the average team score of a winning team in declamation and oratory, etc. (for instance, a team which takes first, second and third place in a public speaking contest other than debates).

The average of any debater's record can thus be averaged in with his record in other types of public speaking contests and the resulting measurement will then be found surprisingly accurate, not only for the purposes of indicating his ability and training, but as predictive of what he may be expected to do for the rest of the season or his school career.

PARLIAMENTARY LAW IN THE SPEECH CURRICULUM

ALTA B. HALL AND ALICE FLEENOR STURGIS
University of Southern California

RECENTLY we visited an educationally modern kindergarten just before noon-time—an hour, as you know, when tiny bodies wriggle and minds are tired. The teacher was attempting to secure calm by entreating in her best pedagogic manner: "Children, let's pretend that our little mouth is a door, our forefinger is a key—now altogether let's pick up the key and lock the door and throw the key away. There now!—the door is locked, so we can't make *any more noise*." Silence rewarded her efforts for perhaps a half minute. Then down in the front row a buzz-zzz sounded. "Oh, Anne," sighed the teacher, "have you forgotten? We locked the door of our mouths tightly and threw the key away." Little Anne's black eyes sparkled and her curls bobbed eagerly as she confided, "Oh, no, Miss Brown, I haven't forgotten at all. I'm just whispering through the keyhole."

Parliamentary procedure has been only "whispering through the keyhole" of the speech curriculum of most colleges and high schools in the United States, and what is more lamentable, there is scant realization of the numerous reasons why this applicant for recognition at the keyhole should be admitted—when, in fact, it should be welcomed by the departments of speech.

There should be a very sympathetic attitude on the part of public speaking exponents towards this applicant, parliamentary procedure, for it was only a few years ago that public speaking himself (or should we say herself, since ladies are credited with so much of the world's talking), was an applicant seeking admission at the door of the Department of English. Can you remember when high schools were proud and felt themselves modern and progressive, to say in their announcements that "'Oral English' is given on Mondays," or that "in the senior class each student is required to give an acceptable speech?" In colleges, in those days, students who were English majors were "advised to take the entire semester's course in public speaking." Today separate departments of public speaking are recognized as essential. Do we not wonder why we were so slow to admit such a practical, vital, and interesting subject to its natural place?

Parliamentary procedure offers a more limited, and yet equally practical and vitally interesting contribution to our academic program.

Why, then, has its value received scant recognition? Why is parliamentary procedure merely a subject to be "touched upon" during some part of a course in public speaking, or to be relegated to the student's debating society? My guess is that few instructors themselves understand either the fundamental principles and the usefulness of the subject itself, or the vital possibilities of its use in public speaking. If parliamentary procedure is to be "squeezed in" at the end of an already crowded course, if it is to be taught as a subject unrelated to other subjects, if it is to be regarded as an arbitrary collection of words, phrases and rules, which serve as "good manners" at meetings, if it is to be taught from a manual, (all of which are arranged with no more attempt at instructive grouping or presentation than a dictionary), and lastly, if the rules of parliamentary procedure are regarded as facts to be memorized, then the subject has indeed few possibilities and should occupy little space in speech curricula.

If, on the other hand, parliamentary procedure is understood and presented as a system of historically developed rules for the behavior of individuals when meeting in a group, if it is to be taught with the aid of a text which is correctly arranged from a psychological and pedagogic standpoint, if its rules are presented not as facts to be memorized, but as logical and inevitable results in a given situation, and if the fundamental principles underlying the whole system are understood and explained—if all these "ifs" are made realities, then the subject creates intense enthusiasm and becomes a live and fascinating part of the speech curriculum.

Parliamentary procedure is neither a supplement to public speaking nor a corollary of it. It is a definite portion of that larger subject. It concerns itself with the methods by which speakers shall present their ideas which they desire acted upon by the group. It is as necessary a part of the speaker's training as is a course in court procedure to the lawyer or a course in the serving of food to the student of domestic science. A lawyer who has a well-prepared argument, but who knows not when to deliver it, or when to fight in its support, or a cook who has prepared succulent dishes, but who does not know when or how to serve them, is handicapped. Just so a speaker—be his speech ever so convincing—unless he knows where and under what conditions to speak when in group meeting, unless he knows the procedure for securing action on his speech if he desires it,—is handicapped. He must likewise know his own rights and the rights of others in the group. This is the training that parliamentary law furnishes.

For by studying parliamentary law as a distinct subject in the speech curriculum, a subject amalgamated with group intercourse, the student realizes more completely the social laws underlying group fellowship; through the class practice he assimilates the idea that the fundamentals of cooperation and of good citizenship are synonymous with the basic principles of parliamentary law; namely, to accede to the will of the majority, to respect the rights of others, to participate in the discussion and work of the group, and to execute in good faith the decisions of the organization even though opposed to his own views. The knowledge of these fundamental principles governing the methods by which speakers present their ideas which they desire acted upon by a group is not gained as a supplement to public speaking, nor as a corollary to it, but as a definite portion of the large field of speech, the portion entitled parliamentary law.

Assuming that you agree with us that parliamentary procedure is a part of the large subject, public speaking, or speech, may we consider some of the advantages of the study of the subject. High in the list of advantages is the fact that parliamentary procedure offers a natural and uniquely-suited psychological method of combating one of the greatest bug-bears of the beginner in public speaking, *fear*. The elimination of fear and the substitution of self-confidence, which ripens into a joy in speech delivery, is the aim of every instructor. Parliamentary procedure, if given a place in the first part of a student's public speaking training, accomplishes this aim in a phenomminally rapid manner. It is so easy for a student to say "I second the motion," or to rise and move "to adjourn" or "to limit debate," that even the most self-conscious student enjoys making these and similar motions. He is thus drawn rapidly into increasing participation through the enthusiasm of the group; he feels the joy of helping to direct the group's progress from the first time he seconds the motion; and the very brevity of definiteness of the parliamentary phrases lend him confidence. It is only a few weeks until even the most timid students will speak briefly before they have had time to think of fear, upon some motion, and those students will soon be surprised to find themselves speaking for several minutes in support of or opposition to a motion. They would suffer fear and self-consciousness if assigned a speech to deliver, yet will speak at some length in impromptu debate. Thus, parliamentary procedure, if given early in a public speaking course, insures a group of students who speak easily and with enthusiasm. It is not difficult to turn these students towards an intensive study and development of their own public speaking.

Not only does parliamentary procedure form an incomparable psychological beginning for public speaking, but it offers another type of psychological training upon which modern education seeks to lay stress. We are told that the great value of football and other team sports lies in the training of the student to think or act as a part of a team or group, seeking to subordinate his personal advantages to that of the group. This same lesson is taught by the study of parliamentary law. Every fundamental principle upon which the subject is based stresses the will and good of the majority, the spirit of fair play, and the speaker's ability to interpret and fit in with the actions of the group.

Another distinct characteristic which parliamentary law tends to develop is that of quick and accurate thinking. Most motions are useful only if made exactly at the proper moment. To make the decision as to when the proper moment has arrived requires a very definite ability to judge quickly and correctly the feelings of the majority and to be able to translate these feelings into the proper motion. Students are forced to give very close attention to the reaction of the audience—an alertness to which the average beginner in public speaking gives little or no attention because of his absorption in his own fear or in his subject. Accuracy, both in judgment of the majority and in choice of motion, develop a high degree of exactness. It is not usually difficult to see that the majority of the group would react favorably to a motion which would cut off debate upon a particular subject, but whether one should move to limit debate or call for the previous question, or move to adjourn, is a matter for accurate decision. One motion will fit the needs of the assembly exactly, while another will fail. A mistaken choice of motion is often as fatal to its maker as was the mistaken choice of direction on the part of Sambo in the well-known war story. The captain, as you remember, cautioned the soldiers, "If you see any big shells coming your way, just zig-zag back and forth, like the ships do when the submarines are after them. Good Luck." Then no more was seen of the colored Sambo. A few weeks later as you recall the Captain was walking through one of the wards in a base hospital when way over in one corner he spied a muchly damaged and battered Sambo. "Well, son," exclaimed the Captain, peering into Sambo's one visible eye, "what in the world happened to you. Didn't you zig-zag like I told you when the big shells came over?" "Yassah, boss, yassah, I sure tried to, but I guess I must have zigged when I oughter 'ave zagged."

The definiteness of parliamentary law enables one to judge just

when he should zig and when he should zag, but this definiteness of motions and procedure do not require memory work. On the other hand, the whole subject taken together, if correctly taught, is a miniature system of logic. Once the purpose of every motion is understood, every rule connected with it could be told by students who know none of the rules. To know what a motion is intended to accomplish, means that one knows when it may be made, by whom, whether or not it would be debatable, amenable, and what vote would be required to pass it. This training and reasoning out and deducing a multitude of rules to cover a given situation is invaluable to speakers. Its especial value to debaters needs no elaboration. The historic sidelights which accompany any explanation of the purposes of motions are likewise of most definite value to students of history and economics. Concrete development of a very definite logical system of thought results in a very quick comprehension of the arrangement and logical progression of all forms of speaking.

This enumeration of some of the outstanding advantages of the study of parliamentary procedure could be followed by a listing of many minor advantages, but these are apparent. Surely a subject which offers a natural and easy beginning of formal public speaking by eliminating fear, which stresses group action and team work, as well as fair play, which develops quick and accurate thinking, and an ability to judge with accuracy the feelings of others, and which, although extremely definite, may be mastered by logical thought rather than by memory, should be welcomed by every leader in public speaking. These advantages are intensified because they are taught through the medium of a subject, which is necessary in this present day and age to everyone from beginner in kindergarten who serves on the flower committee up to the mother in the Parent-Teachers Association or the father who leads in his professional meetings. Organizations and committees are the one medium through which groups function and through which group opinion may be expressed. In all social institutions is this interdependence of group association, parliamentary law, and public speaking.

PRACTICAL ASPECTS OF THE HIGH SCHOOL ASSEMBLY

FRIEDA ROGATSKY
Norwood (Ohio) High School

THE high school assembly can be one of the most generally educative forces in the school; conversely it can be a breeding-place of bad manners and, in extreme cases, of a general disciplinary problem. Difficult as it is to foretell what the future holds for the boys and girls of today, of one fact we can be reasonably sure; namely, that more than ever before the American high school will be the people's university.

> In the flush periods of the past it may have been possible to argue that the public high school is a gigantic piece of social extravagance, but that time is gone forever. . . A national minimum wage law has effectively removed millions of young people from all possibility of entering industry. It is the school or the street for them.[1]

Under this new social order, there must be a more serious effort made to give our pupils intriguing glimpses of arts and interests which will stand them in good stead in times of leisure, whether enforced or otherwise.

> For those who hold the social view of the function of education the collapse of the "fads and frills" is disheartening. . . The children entering the first grade this year are to grow up in a world when the work week seems likely to be no longer than twenty-five or thirty hours. Somehow they must be trained to fill that leisure happily and with value to themselves and society.[2]

In the inevitable curtailing of the curriculum during these lean years, the teaching of speech has suffered in many places. In a recent address before a large convention of teachers, Miss Florence Hale, first vice-president of the N.E.A., made a stirring plea for more speech work as an aid in the training of character and personality. She said:

> One of the demands of the new education is to develop leadership which we have found is lacking these last few years in spite of our expensive school systems. To begin right where we are, I think that we should have more oral reading in our schools, more debates and more public speaking, not for the sake of bringing up orators or actors, but because a person can not lead who can not impress his personality upon other people. He must speak so he can be heard.

[1] A. D. Carlson, *Deflating the Schools* (1933).
[2] *Ibid.*

He must know how to express his thoughts vividly and clearly. We have been neglecting these practices in our schools in favor of silent reading, which has its part to play, but which has in some places been overdone to the extent that after the fourth grade very little has been done in the way of oral expression.

Whatever unfortunate reductions have had to be made, and may still be made in the field of speech, the assembly remains as the natural place for the entire school to see adequate demonstrations of platform performance and for a great number to have the invaluable training of practice in cultural arts which are being denied them elsewhere.

It has been said that the assembly can be a breeding place of bad manners and even of much more serious trouble. A high school audience which causes a guest speaker to terminate his speech abruptly and walk off the stage will inevitably go from the assembly with minds bent on further mischief. Recently a clergyman who was asked to speak before a high school assembly remarked, "That can be a terrible audience!" However true that criticism may be, it is the important task of the assembly director to train the audience to a recognition of social or group responsibility which will be adequate to induce polite attention and control even when a program is not pleasing. It is no exaggeration to say that the need for such training is often as painfully evident in adult audiences.

The primary question, then, is one of establishing a desirable attitude in every individual who is connected with the assembly. No one can be omitted here, for the support of principal and teachers is as important as that of the pupils. The assembly at its best can be compared with a well-ordered class room where the utmost possible freedom is permitted without sacrificing order and good conduct. A very practical problem will illustrate this point. To have pupils sit in individually assigned seats in the assembly simplifies the work of the individual teacher; but to train pupils in social control while allowing them the freedom of choosing their own seats, while more difficult, is surely far more educative.

The director dares not forget for a moment that the time of hundreds of pupils and of a corps of teachers counted either in minutes or in dollars and cents is valuable. Therefore the assembly must provide something of information, of inspiration, of individual and group training on some object lesson in public performance which will justify the time spent. This by no means implies the expenditure of large sums of money. It does mean, however, that the utmost care must be taken in program-making.

Today the watchword in the assembly as in the class room is pupil participation to the highest possible degree. This can be justified in several ways: in schools where pupil programs are the rule, the pupils themselves greatly prefer them; furthermore, the policy of pupil participation is in line with the best educational thought of today. This plan does not exclude the use of outside speakers and of other interesting features. These have their value in lending variety, and particularly in the fact that, when they are good, they demonstrate the art of speaking or of music or other activities in a state of perfection which pupil programs can not attain.

A New York clergyman who speaks successfully to a Middle West high school assembly every year, recently used the pause most effectively in summarizing his points. Repeatedly that day, speech students remarked, "Did you hear that pause?" In this case a minute's demonstration of a means of emphasis was infinitely more graphic than an hour's classroom discussion could be.

What to have in the assembly will always be the greatest problem of the director. In this connection several points must always be kept in mind. If pupils are to participate, the materials used must emanate from their own interests, and they must be allowed to express their likes and dislikes by questionnaire, question-box or in private conversation. The programs must be as varied as possible, for through the radio, the public has become accustomed to a wide range of good entertainment. Pupils must be allowed to do their own work and must be made to feel responsible for the success of programs. Moreover, programs must be sufficiently finished to command respect, if not admiration. A grave danger lurks in the fatuous attitude that any effort, because it is sincere, is worthy of a place on the program. There is no audience so fine balanced between a sense of the ridiculous and of serious appreciation as a high school audience. To expose a badly prepared pupil to such an audience may mean stamping him through his failure with a feeling of inadequacy and defeat.

In the building of programs, the director must make use of every possible usual and unusual school activity. There are interesting possibilities in the innumerable organizations of the present high school. Because the span of attention in high school pupils is naturally short, the most popular program is the one which includes a number of short offerings, rather than a single long feature.

A Math Club can furnish an interesting fifteen-minute demonstration by constructing and explaining a six-foot slide rule. Boy Scouts

can advertise their organization in a twenty-minute program, including bugle calls illustrated with pantomimes or shadowgraphs, an actual demonstration of making a fire, and an impressive reciting of the scout oath. The work of a pottery class can be shown very vividly when short talks are illustrated with exhibits of pottery in various stages of construction. A year book can be advertised by combining various chemicals to show what colors will appear in the book. In the accompanying discourse, the various features of the book can be presented very cleverly.

Larger organizations, such as Athletic Associations and musical groups can be entrusted with working out an entire program. But always to be successful, the program must be carefully planned, with a somewhat unified idea, if possible.

The director must not be afraid of novelties. If there is danger that a new idea may not be well received, a frank statement on the part of the pupil chairman will almost invariably awaken the sense of sportsmanship which is latent in high school audiences.

Programs must be planned with the avowed purpose of growth in real value. A question box on assemblies recently brought repeated requests for more music, particularly popular music. However we may sympathize with such requests the fact remains and must be faced that a program of popular music early in the day is not conducive to the best work in the periods which follow. It should be said in passing that an assembly which disturbs the real work of the school is too dangerous an element to be tolerated. For this reason pep meetings should be held at the end of the day and should be relegated to the gymnasium.

In the particular case referred to, the request for popular music was granted to the extent of including immediately on a program a banjo player, the best boy singer in the school, and a few numbers for the entire group to sing. Within the month, a whole program of classical music was offered, though with considerable trepidation. The precaution was taken to have as two of the three performers, alumni who had graduated recently enough to be familiar to the audience. The result was gratifying and paves the way for a similar venture in the future.

However carefully the program may be planned and guided, the director's zeal for excellence must not lead him to do the actual work for the pupils. There is a great temptation to give too much help, to stifle the originality of the pupils. The audience will make loyal allowance for a certain degree of imperfection and will be equally

quick to single out work that is palpably that of teacher rather than pupil.

As has been said before, it is a fallacy to assume that every pupil in the school can or must have a place on the assembly program. It is foolish to expect an audience of adolescents to remain polite and interested when the performance is crude and boring because of the utter inadequacy of the participants. It is not given to every human being to perform acceptably before hundreds of people. It must be the fate of a great number merely to learn to listen intelligently and appreciatively just as it is the fate of many to follow where others lead. To train a high school audience to be appreciative listeners is one of the most important tasks of the director. This task has become immeasurably more difficult because of the radio, for people who are accustomed to turning the dial impatiently when a radio program has ceased to attract are sure to become restive under a program which fails to interest.

Once the program has had careful planning and thorough preparation—those fundamentals of speech work—, the director must remove himself physically from proximity to the stage, become part of the audience and leave the responsibility with the pupils. If a crisis arises, the pupil must rise to it, and gain experience and power in doing so. It is Stevenson who said in times of danger, we usually find ourselves a great deal braver and better than we thought. On a Christmas program, which can hardly fail to be an exciting occasion, a girl who was having her first experience as chairman was faced with the difficulty of having an adult in the audience faint. She handled the problem which arose from the confusion with commendable skill, and grew in stature and self-confidence because she succeeded through her own efforts.

Keeping the assembly within the alloted time is an important factor in order. The child in the adolescent responds best to a well-ordered routine, and if the assembly is like a class room in other respects it should also begin promptly and end within the allotted time. Anyone who is experienced in assembly work knows what difficulties are entailed in such a statement.

The assembly need never be a disciplinary problem if it is planned with sufficient care. When difficulties do arise, it is wisest to let the pupils do the disciplining in carefully planned talks, or to take up the problem in the school paper. It is as useless for a teacher or principal to scold an entire assembly as it is for a minister to reproach the congregation before him for a small attendance. But when a

group of Hi-Y boys, for example, request an extra assembly to take up the matter of poor sportsmanship at a game or poor attention in the assembly and they are allowed to plan their own effective measures, the school has arrived at an advanced point of group control.

In regard to outside speakers, it is deplorable that so many good speakers come to utter grief before a high school audience. This is sometimes due to the fact that a speaker, either too busy or too thoughtless of his opportunity to prepare himself adequately, uses an old speech which fails to interest either because it is warmed over or because it is only partially suitable to the audience. More often it is because the very fact of entering a school reminds a speaker of his childish attitudes, and he feels the necessity of appealing to the child in the adolescent rather than to the adult. It is a wise speaker who takes a high school audience seriously. Recently the woman president of a Chinese girls' college, speaking on modern China, held her audience of a thousand pupils for the entire assembly period without a single joke or wise-crack.

The response to well-organized assembly work is its own reward. A quickening of interest on the part of pupils puts the director in the position of being able to choose from those who are eager to take part instead of having to coax the unwilling. He finds that with this quickened interest will come many valuable suggestions for the building of programs. Generally speaking pupils are most appreciative of the efforts of their comrades, and most critical of outsiders. The inspiration that high school pupils receive from adequate adult speeches and performers is beyond estimation, and such programs, carefully selected, should be included with sufficient frequency to keep a high standard before the school. But in the last analysis, the value of the high school assembly for both the active participants and the passive audience lies in the pupil contributions, their enthusiasms and their growth.

EDITORIALS

EDITORIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. Hudson is withdrawing from the active editorship for the remaining portion of his term of office, which ends November, 1935; Professor Claude M. Wise, Editor-Elect of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL will act as Editor, beginning with the April issue. All manuscripts of articles, or communications regarding them, should be addressed to Mr. Wise. For the present, the remainder of the staff remains without change.

A GLANCE BACK

The editor, having summoned the Chief Statistician, learns a few facts about the nine issues of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL edited by the present staff, from February, 1933, to February, 1935, inclusive. There have been 116 contributors of major articles—as distinguished from book reviews, letters to the Forum, and so on. Of this number, sixty-five contributors were appearing in these pages for the first time. In other words, in every issue we have given seven people a chance to make their *debuts* as contributors to the journal of their profession and to take a place in the permanent record of that profession's history. If we were to add the authors who had previously contributed only once, the figure would grow to about three-fourths of the total list.

The purpose of the above statistic is merely to destroy any notion, if such a notion anywhere exists, that a professional journal such as this one is a closed corporation, open only to writers who already have made a name for scholarly publication. Yet the editor (not to mention the Chief Statistician) does not want to give the impression that the youngsters have a monopoly upon truth. Surely some of these new contributors will want to be heard again, and thus will become old-timers themselves. The staff points with equal pride to the fact that its 116 contributors also include such veterans as Thomas C. Trueblood (a prize in any collection!), James M. O'Neill, Everett L. Hunt, Edwin C. Mabie, Ralph Dennis, Bromley Smith, Lee Emerson Bassett, and C. S. Bluemel. The list might be lengthened considerably if we were to name such comparatively young veterans as

William Norwood Brigance, Lionel Crocker, Clarence Simon, Arleigh B. Williamson, Edward Z. Rowell, Giles W. Gray, and Earl W. Wiley, all of whom are on our roster of 1933–35 contributors. Along with all of these we have had the pleasure of presenting, among our new contributors, some distinguished outsiders—Hamlin Garland, Thomas A. Knott (General Editor of the second edition of *Webster's New International Dictionary*), Professor Lane Cooper (first American translator of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*), John L. Tildsley (Assistant Superintendent of Schools, New York City), Principal John M. Loughran of Brooklyn, and some others. Enough has been said to indicate that the staff takes a high degree of pride (the exact degree to be determined by the Chief Statistician) in the personnel of contributors to the past nine issues.

Yet there should have been a greater number of contributors, both new and old. Articles of worth have had to lie in the files or be returned to those who felt a highly creditable desire to get their names upon this roster. Depressed financial support, causing a limitation of our size, has of course been largely to blame. On the other hand, even with much better support, the QUARTERLY JOURNAL probably could not print all worthy articles now being offered to it. For the fact is plain that more articles are available than at any previous moment in the twenty years of this journal's lifetime. Even though the new *Archives of Speech* and the new *Speech Monographs* are serving as outlets for a certain number of more advanced studies, the supply for the QUARTERLY JOURNAL holds up and increases. One reason for this is the rising tide of graduate work described by Professor O'Neill in this issue. Another reason is the new interest in the program of speech in elementary and secondary schools. The real point of this paragraph is to voice the hope that the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION may find itself financially able to risk an enlarged QUARTERLY JOURNAL, in order to give more adequate expression to the increased articulateness of the profession and the new importance of our subject. The Chief Statistician, together with all other men of good will, shares this hope.

THE FORUM

ENGLISH DEBATING RECONSIDERED

Editor of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

The contrast between American and English debating has been viewed as the difference between the pursuit of pleasure and the cultivation of discipline—a sort of Stoic vs. Epicurean controversy, with the American as the noble Roman. Not so long ago a Cambridge graduate told me that Oxford was entirely to blame for this degeneracy in English debating. Up until about 1920, he thought, debating at the Cambridge Union had preserved a sobriety worthy of the serious matters discussed; but when the Oxford and Cambridge Unions began to exchange speakers more frequently the wit of the Oxford students, their "educated insolence," was so disconcerting that the young Cambridge statesmen began to affect the attitude. After attending debates at the Cambridge Union for a term I can testify that Cambridge wit is no less educated or insolent than that enjoyed at Oxford. In fact I suspect that Cambridge debating was never so seriously analytical as my friend, an ex-president of the Union, imagined. My suspicions rest partly upon an experience of two terms of debate-going among sober Scotsmen at Edinburgh. When Scotsmen can be so hilarious in their debating I am driven to the conclusion that American debating takes its discipline from the professors. If Scottish students will not be logical when playing freely with their minds, then surely logic in a debate is an achievement and not an instinct.

Some of the results of this freedom seem to be highly commendable. In choosing and stating propositions the students seem to have different aims in mind from those of the writers of American textbooks. Without arguing the matter I should like to state my belief that the Scottish questions present an opportunity for a more interesting and varied program of undergraduate discussion than the questions accepted for intercollegiate rivalry by the debating leagues of America. If I were to cite only the best questions I should be supporting my point unfairly, so I submit the whole list of questions debated by the various societies at Edinburgh University this year.

The programs for the year are printed in advance in the Student Handbook. Many items other than debates appear in the programs, and the societies differ in the extent of their interest in debating, but even the technical and scientific societies are likely to have a few debates in the course of the year. Here are the questions:

DIAGNOSTIC SOCIETY

This house deplores the Oxford Group Movement
The Scottish Renaissance is a second childhood
No state is less conducive to virtue than penury
The national state has outlived its usefulness
Civilization is sophistication
Virtue is its own reward
America is the home of exploded fallacies
The B.B.C. is a menace to democracy
Mussolini deserves the thanks of Europe
Blood-sports should be abolished
The growth of individualism is prejudicial to the interests of society

DIALECTICAL SOCIETY

The writing of History is an art rather than a science
Discipline is the urgent need of the day
This house approves autonomy for India
The tendency of Post-War fiction is pernicious
Grace before Lamb is correct
Home Rule would be advantageous in Scotland
Sectarianism is better than conformity
The Reformation is eternally to be regretted
No Angler can be a good man
National security should be risked to promote disarmament
Prophetic visions are of more value than traditions
The madness of the Englishman has been the salvation of the world

PHILOMATHIC SOCIETY

Those who have done most for the world are those who have cared least for the world
Joab will die as Samson died
The University polishes the pebble and dims the diamond
Scotland is a proud parasite on her past
Disobedience, in the light of history, is man's original virtue

UNIONIST ASSOCIATION

Slums are a greater menace to Capitalism than the Soviet Union
This House approves the government's Indian Policy
America should attempt to control the Middle West before attempting to control Europe
The Chancellor of the Exchequer should reduce taxation

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND SOCIETY

This House prefers a landlady to a spouse
The Lounge Lizard is preferable to the Cave Man
Dress reform for men is desirable
A university education leads to physical, mental, moral degradation
The Face is never an adequate index to the mind
A ring on the hand is worth two on the phone
The policeman's lot is not a happy one

HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Democracy is doomed
The modern cinema is a drug
The impulse is more reliable than the syllogism
Character rather than knowledge is the criterion of education
The sun has set on the British Empire
Modern poetry is either unintelligible or unimportant
The Yellow Press is a world menace
England has been made by the sea
The Middle Class is, and always has been, the Golden Mean
Vulgarity is characteristic of modern life
The Kirk has been more of a curse than a blessing to Scotland
It is better to realize the ideal than to idealize the real
It is by realizing that men are not equal that we are able to adjust the relations between White and Black
The female of the species should be useful rather than ornamental
Poverty condemns our modern civilization

THE TALKING WOMEN

The intercourse between nations should be regulated by the same moral principles as should govern the intercourse between individuals
Education, not feminine frailty, makes the woman
The novel of today is over-psychologized
It is better to travel hopefully than to arrive

THE WOMEN'S CELTIC SOCIETY

The suggested repopulation of the Highlands by Jewish Refugees is impracticable
A shiny nose is preferable to a hole in the heel of the stocking
The modern girl could teach her grandmother to suck eggs
Introspection destroys hypocrisy

THE ORKNEY AND SHETLAND ASSOCIATION

The savage is happier than the civilized man
The future destiny of the world lies with the scientists and not with the politicians
Woman has achieved nothing in science and in art

The questions of the Cambridge Union for the Easter term showed the same tendency to relieve serious discussion with gayety.

In a debate on socialism, however, when an ex-President of the Union who had held cabinet office under the Labor government returned to speak, the discussion was kept strictly relevant, earnest, and devoid of humor. This was due to the interest in the question rather than to the presence of a statesman. Almost every debate brings back some member of distinction. The undergraduate's easy arrogance, coupled with the older man's freedom from a public manner and evident pleasure at being back with the boys, makes the situation somewhat easier than it would ordinarily be in America if a sophomore were pitting his opinion against that of a senator. If the New Deal policy of government by assistant professors should be continued, however, the atmosphere of the Oxford and Cambridge Unions may be created in American universities.

The freedom with which colleagues disagree with each other, supporting or opposing a motion for entirely different reasons, lends subtlety and variety to the debate. These differences are emphasized rather than concealed, and they heighten the sense of individuality in the speaker.

The final debate of the year on the motion that the house regretted that two and two made four brought forth a display of rhetoric that would have delighted DeQuincey. The supporters of the motion exalted the mathematical mysticism of Protagoras over the low cunning of cost accountants; they deprecated the disastrous attempt to apply physical reasoning to committee government; they lamented the passing of chivalry; they elevated the art of regretting gracefully what can't be helped into a noble stoicism; they deplored the calculation of war debt claims and comparative scores; they denounced mathematical certainty as inconsistent with a sporting Englishman's love of fair play. The opponents of the motion were amazed that in Cambridge, the home of mathematical relativity, the truth of the proposition should be so readily conceded; since there was no opportunity to debate on truth, but only on an attitude, the attitude of regret, they must comment on the futility of mournful resignation as contrasted with a joyous acceptance of the universe. The proponents of the motion were guilty of praising ideals that could not endure the truth of science; they were ungrateful for the small element of certainty that makes life livable; as debaters they might at least be grateful that men could put two and two together. Such a debate, delightful from beginning to end, is possible only in an atmosphere of freedom and spontaneity.

In his speaking the young Englishman cultivates the manner of

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND SOCIETY

This House prefers a landlady to a spouse
The Lounge Lizard is preferable to the Cave Man
Dress reform for men is desirable
A university education leads to physical, mental, moral degradation
The Face is never an adequate index to the mind
A ring on the hand is worth two on the phone
The policeman's lot is not a happy one

HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Democracy is doomed
The modern cinema is a drug
The impulse is more reliable than the syllogism
Character rather than knowledge is the criterion of education
The sun has set on the British Empire
Modern poetry is either unintelligible or unimportant
The Yellow Press is a world menace
England has been made by the sea
The Middle Class is, and always has been, the Golden Mean
Vulgarity is characteristic of modern life
The Kirk has been more of a curse than a blessing to Scotland
It is better to realize the ideal than to idealize the real
It is by realizing that men are not equal that we are able to adjust the relations between White and Black
The female of the species should be useful rather than ornamental
Poverty condemns our modern civilization

THE TALKING WOMEN

The intercourse between nations should be regulated by the same moral principles as should govern the intercourse between individuals
Education, not feminine frailty, makes the woman
The novel of today is over-psychologized
It is better to travel hopefully than to arrive

THE WOMEN'S CELTIC SOCIETY

The suggested repopulation of the Highlands by Jewish Refugees is impracticable
A shiny nose is preferable to a hole in the heel of the stocking
The modern girl could teach her grandmother to suck eggs
Introspection destroys hypocrisy

THE ORKNEY AND SHETLAND ASSOCIATION

The savage is happier than the civilized man
The future destiny of the world lies with the scientists and not with the politicians
Woman has achieved nothing in science and in art

The questions of the Cambridge Union for the Easter term showed the same tendency to relieve serious discussion with gayety.

In a debate on socialism, however, when an ex-President of the Union who had held cabinet office under the Labor government returned to speak, the discussion was kept strictly relevant, earnest, and devoid of humor. This was due to the interest in the question rather than to the presence of a statesman. Almost every debate brings back some member of distinction. The undergraduate's easy arrogance, coupled with the older man's freedom from a public manner and evident pleasure at being back with the boys, makes the situation somewhat easier than it would ordinarily be in America if a sophomore were pitting his opinion against that of a senator. If the New Deal policy of government by assistant professors should be continued, however, the atmosphere of the Oxford and Cambridge Unions may be created in American universities.

The freedom with which colleagues disagree with each other, supporting or opposing a motion for entirely different reasons, lends subtlety and variety to the debate. These differences are emphasized rather than concealed, and they heighten the sense of individuality in the speaker.

The final debate of the year on the motion that the house regretted that two and two made four brought forth a display of rhetoric that would have delighted DeQuincey. The supporters of the motion exalted the mathematical mysticism of Protagoras over the low cunning of cost accountants; they deprecated the disastrous attempt to apply physical reasoning to committee government; they lamented the passing of chivalry; they elevated the art of regretting gracefully what can't be helped into a noble stoicism; they deplored the calculation of war debt claims and comparative scores; they denounced mathematical certainty as inconsistent with a sporting Englishman's love of fair play. The opponents of the motion were amazed that in Cambridge, the home of mathematical relativity, the truth of the proposition should be so readily conceded; since there was no opportunity to debate on truth, but only on an attitude, the attitude of regret, they must comment on the futility of mournful resignation as contrasted with a joyous acceptance of the universe. The proponents of the motion were guilty of praising ideals that could not endure the truth of science; they were ungrateful for the small element of certainty that makes life livable; as debaters they might at least be grateful that men could put two and two together. Such a debate, delightful from beginning to end, is possible only in an atmosphere of freedom and spontaneity.

In his speaking the young Englishman cultivates the manner of

soliloquizing in epigrams. He is a bit of a poet, and holds his audience by an occasional good thing uttered for the joy of self-expression rather than by a continuous and direct communication. It was something of a shock to a teacher who has spent years insisting on communication as the fundamental quality in public speaking, to find that when an occasional speaker, usually an American, did bring a lively sense of communication to bear upon his audience, the effect was often disagreeable; the atmosphere of salesmanship was created, and one no longer had the pleasure of expectantly watching a man thinking.

EVERETT HUNT, *Swarthmore College*

Editor of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

Professor Thomas' joint review [*Q.J.S.*, November, 1934] of *The Jingle Book for Speech Correction* by Alice L. Wood, *Graded Objectives for Teaching Good American Speech*, and the pamphlet *Suggestions in Speech Improvement for the Use of Classroom Teachers*, contains implications which do an injustice to the authors of the two books and mis-states the objectives of the Department of Speech Improvement. Since many of the controversial statements contained in Professor Thomas' review are due to his misapprehension of the relation among these three books, I feel it may be helpful to clear up the matter and to state positively what the Department of Speech Improvement of New York City is trying to do.

First, the only one of the three books which presents an official point of view, or which has official sanction, is the pamphlet. I am sorry that Miss Wood's little book should be damned with the faint praise of giving merely lip-service to the doctrines of the department. It is a valuable enough contribution, I think, to merit individual attention.

As for the *Graded Objectives* the authors of that volume are answering the reviewer's objections in a separate letter, so I leave the matter to them.

Returning to the little pamphlet, may I say that the committee is abashed to find this informal grouping of model lesson-plans, drills, and practice sentences, achieving the dignity of review in the august columns of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH. It is merely the printed version of a set of mimeographed sheets which the department used to distribute during Open School Week. It is filled with "request numbers" attempting to supply practice material for the

difficulties of which the classroom teachers are, themselves, aware. As the foreword states, it is not the purpose of this pamphlet to discuss all the sounds of English.

The arrangement of sounds was dictated "by the relative frequency of their mispronunciation, rather than by a logical, phonetic order." It is emphatically not a course of study nor an attempt to set up a standard of pronunciation. Neither of these functions has been delegated to the Bureau, but reside in the Board of Superintendents and their committee on syllabi.

However, since Professor Thomas, on the basis of three books, has attempted to *suppose* what the objective of speech training in the New York City schools is, it may be of some interest here to state what we actually are trying to do.

First, we aim to supply our students with a type of speech which, as Professor Krapp says, "is least likely to attract attention to itself as being peculiar to any class or locality." Indeed, we are attempting to give them a dialect which conforms very closely to "Eastern Standard Speech" as defined by Professors Gray and Wise in their excellent new book *Bases of Speech*, page 230. Even more specifically we are attempting to eradicate those deviations from the Eastern Standard Speech which are listed on pages 232 to 234. This seems to us a more useful basis for a standard than the regional dialect whose users call it "General American" but which seems to a cosmopolitan ear provincial, not to say rural.

Specifically, in the pamphlet, while a "broad *a*" in words such as "ask" and "can't" is permitted, the "compromise *a*" is listed. The reason for this compromise is pragmatic. Students whose habitual pronunciation of the word *ask* is [ɛ̃əsk] can be lured into an acceptable [æsk] or [ask] where they will balk at the British [a·sk] which they hear less often among well-spoken natives. Pronunciation of the vowel in "dog" as a short vowel with some lip rounding, is quoted by Krapp on page 83, "as occurring with some speakers in many syllables written with 'o' " and on page 230 of the *Bases of Speech* short *o* [ɐ] as in got, Hottentot [gɐt, hɐtəntɐt] is given first preference as the standard for Eastern Speech.

Professor Thomas could hardly have done us a greater disservice than to have suggested that we are attempting to enforce the British standard. Specifically, wherever there is a difference between British usage and Eastern standard usage, the American form is given preference. Actually, we are more concerned to remove dentalization, palatilization, nasalization, and the unvoicing of

the final voiced consonants than we are in acquiring a "broad *a*."

In closing, may I suggest that what has been said here is to be taken literally and is not only the writer's personal opinion but is the guiding principle of both the elementary and the high school speech work. It is based not on theoretical considerations, nor on an attempt to impose on the rest of the country any standard. It is the result of years of classroom practice in overcoming the welter of difficult and complicated speech problems which are so eloquently described by Professor Thomas on pages 567 and 568. If we ever succeed in eliminating from the speech of our students those local, vulgar, and foreign deviations which are apt to set up unfavorable emotional reactions in the minds and hearts of the people with whom they must associate, we shall not quibble about a "broad *a*" a short *o*" or an "inverted *r*."

Thank you for allowing me to set forth here our problem as we see it.

LETITIA RAUBICHECK, Director of Speech Improvement, *New York City*

NEW BOOKS

Oral Argument. By Donald Hayworth and Robert B. Capel. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1933; pp. 428; $2.

This work, according to the authors, "is designed primarily for classroom instruction." It is throughout a text in the procedure and practice of debate, confining its discussion to that phase of argumentation. It contains a wealth of detailed information on every conceivable aspect of the debate process, from the choice of a proposition to the final decision of three judges, an expert judge, or an audience, which should render it of value as a textbook for debate coaches and debate squads. Every consideration of each chapter is fully illustrated and is accompanied by what seem on the whole to be well thought out and useful exercises. Since a successful effort seems to have been made to simplify terminology and technical discussion of argumentation, the work should be comprehensible to high school as well as college debaters.

The text, like most recent works on argumentation, approaches and treats the subject, not as a purely logical process, but as a blending of logic and audience-psychology. A number of the chapters, particularly "Refutation," contain excellent common sense on when to employ and when not to employ certain tenets of argumentation, and what to refute and what not to refute. Among the best chapters are those on "Research," "Evaluation of Evidence," "Refutation," "Language in Debate," "Debate Practices and Variations in Debating," and "Judging." The chapter on "Developing a Case" might provide the student with more complete instruction in determining issues. Some important subject-matter on analysis, generally included in other textbooks, is here omitted; for example, clash of opinion; and all discussion of the brief is relegated to the Appendix, where it is likely to be over-looked. "Patterns of Proof," the discussion of forms of argument, appears to be somewhat slighted in favor of some of the other chapters. There is a good discussion of analogy, which fails, however, to call attention to the fact that analogy proves only probability; a good discussion of authority. Generalization and causal relation seem somewhat less fully treated than other parts of the book and less adequately illustrated. In treating

"Deduction," it might have been better to omit the hypothetical and disjunctive syllogisms, unless they could have been more fully treated.

The consistent emphasis upon debate technics, while this does not materially alter the treatment of a number of the chapters from that of the general run of argumentative texts, might well seem limiting to the teacher whose course in argumentation deals only partially, or not at all, with debate. While the authors do not, perhaps, assume that there is a sufficient carry-over from debate training to equip a student for the non-debate argumentative speech, nonetheless, the constant phrasing of everything in terms of debate, the exclusive debate-treatment of the subjects of many chapters, for example, refutation and persuasion, and the inclusion of "Strategy" leave something to be desired for a broader course in argumentation.

Oral Argument, as a presentation solely from the angle of debate, will be recognized as a departure from the usual treatment of argumentation. Baker and Huntington, and the greater number of authors who have followed, seem to have looked upon argumentation as a discipline in straight thinking, as a safeguard against error in the building of a case for an audience, and as a method of rendering an intellectually honest personal conviction convincing to others. Considered in the light of ideals of liberal arts education, a course based on such traditional instruction in argumentation is unassailable. However, it must be recognized that another widespread academic attitude towards argumentation exists—though most certainly not viewed sympathetically by all debate teams or teachers—that primarily of preparing debaters and debates to demonstrate the superiority of the team debating, rather than the superiority of the affirmative or the negative of the social question at issue.

Although *Oral Argument* does give clear and, with the exceptions noted above, reasonably exhaustive instruction on accepted principles of argumentation, in view of its wide departure from the traditional instruction in argumentation a few questions might well be asked regarding the changed emphasis.

Assuming that public address is one of the influential means of shaping public opinion and influencing public action, and that efforts to shape conviction can be either social—according to the standards of honor, the intellectual honesty, facility in straight thinking, and the social ideals of the speaker—or anti-social in the absence of any or all of these, and assuming that liberal education fosters recognition of and devotion to truth in social and personal conduct and seeks to stimulate social as against anti-social attitudes, does *Oral Argument*,

in the standards it sets and in what it advances as instruction, recognize the following social and educational obligations?

Will the text be influential in cultivating in students, in relation to their speaking, a sense of social responsibility? Is its discipline conducive to intellectual integrity? Will it stimulate in students such a high regard for truth, as essential in furthering the social good, that they will prefer to see truth triumph, even when advanced by an opponent, rather than win against it? Does it attempt to stimulate in speakers that sense of honor and fair play which scorns winning over an opponent by tricks of strategy or by appeals to commonly-held false premises? Are the social and intellectual standards it sets for students in keeping with the standards of liberal education?

The reviewer will not take the responsibility of answering these questions in full. Briefly, however, it would seem from a host of statements spread throughout the work that the consistent emphasis here is upon winning, that the dominant social attitude seems that of always coming out on top yourself, in debate and in life, and that trick attacks to win and questionable persuasive strategy are treated in great detail.

ARLEIGH B. WILLIAMSON, *New York University*

Principles of Effective Speaking. By WILLIAM PHILLIPS SANDFORD AND WILLARD HAYES YEAGER. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1934; pp. 358.

The original edition of this work appeared in 1928 and the second edition in 1930; now, in 1934, the third edition comes off the press in an attractive new format, improved in literary quality, and enlarged in subject matter. Emil Ludwig remarked that once one of his books was published he lost interest in it, as he lost interest in an old love affair. This observation epitomizes the dangers facing a man who would improve on one of his earlier tasks. It takes a certain amount of daring to undertake the revision of a text that has met the approval of its author. It calls for faith in one's effort and a sublime confidence in the correctness of one's theories. It demands, if the revision is to be something more than perfunctory, an additional maturity of judgment and a better assimilation of material than that called for by the original venture.

The enthusiasm of the authors of this revision is manifested by the fact that every word of the text has been rewritten. The result has been a distinct improvement in the literary quality of the book.

A greater organic unity, a more lively drift of development, a surer approach to problems, a better grasp of essentials, and a superior dignity of treatment, all mark the effort. The earlier editions bore a tone of oral discourse, as if the writing had been the product of a series of lectures. Not so with the revision. Sentences are better disposed, paragraphs more contained, diction improved, and invaluable contractions practised, as when Chapters I and II, for example, have been condensed into a single chapter. The style of the essayist now characterizing the text makes for a more readable book.

Important is the changed appearance of the volume. The original editions were bulky articles, thick and narrow to the hand. The longer and wider pages of the new edition, together with its greater compactness, make the volume easier to handle; and the black covers webbed in gilt make it more pleasing to the eye.

Valid additions to the text include suggestive speech subjects, outlines of speeches, and specimens of speeches, representing both student and craftsman. The discussion of "Style" (Chapter XIII.) including examples of Imagery, Rhythm, and Figures, corrects an omission of earlier editions. The vital contribution to the revision, however, is found in Chapter IV, where "The Speaker and the Speech Situation" are discussed. The earlier editions emphasized the importance of *logical* and *emotional* factors as ways and means of achieving effective speech. To this analysis the authors have added a correlative factor. This factor is defined as *ethical* appeal, and it is explained as "the persuasion of the speaker's personality." Under this discussion the speaker's character, his popularity, and other subjective and objective ramifications pertinent to the subject are treated. The vitality of the text is enhanced by the addition of this point of view.

To those interested in speaking as a useful art, and who believe that speaking is essentially an activity of mind, the revision of this book, improved in appearance, in style, and enlarged in content, should prove valuable.

EARL W. WILEY, *Ohio State University*

A Player's Handbook, The Theory and Practice of Acting. By SAMUEL SELDEN. New York: F. S. Crofts and Company, 1934; pp. xi, 252.

In 1932 Samuel French published *A Handbook of Acting*, by Madame Eva Alberti, which Mr. Selden in the Selected Bibliography

to his own book calls "the most valuable book on the art of pantomime." Critics may or may not agree with his judgment about the absolute merit of Madame Alberti's book. In the opinion of this reviewer, the teacher of a beginning class in acting would do far better to put Mr. Selden's own book into the hands of his students than to have them read first Madame Alberti's *Handbook of Acting*, even though the art of pantomime were to be the only aspect of acting discussed. Mr. Selden's treatment of the subject is less diffuse, more concrete, and more practical from the point of view of the student.

In simple language he discusses the elements for study and practice which are necessary to the understanding and projection of a part. It is distinctly a book for the beginner, though not necessarily confined in value to the amateur. Perhaps it skims too lightly over the surface of things. It intellectualizes less than Calvert or Boleslavsky or Stark Young. But its value probably lies in its omissions and condensations. Which is to say that it appears to fulfill its purpose admirably.

There is an introductory chapter on the art of the actor in which the nature of art and the classification of art forms is briefly discussed, followed by a statement of the requirements and training of the actor. Another chapter treats of "Communication and Response": the actor's language, the expression of emotion, and the response to emotion. Two chapters following (which form the actual backbone of the book) deal with the training of the body and voice for expressiveness. They have to do with the commonplace elements of handling the body, walking, standing, sitting, turning, cultivation of awareness, control, grace, and presence; and with the training of the vocal mechanism for greater flexibility and expressiveness. As any teacher or director will agree, these are the details which make his body rack and hair turn gray when they must be taught for any given production. They are the reasons why he would rather cast for the leading rôle (or any other rôle) the actress with the commonplace face and figure who knows how to use both, than the girl who looks like Venus and walks like the Juggernaut; and why he prefers as hero the man whose voice will give the audience least pain to the one who must first have his voice amputated from his nose and grafted to the throat and mouth. There are also some of the reasons why professional managers turn down the "inexperienced." Mr. Selden very rightly puts first things first, urging the long-range training of the actor's body and voice so that he may have at instant command a broad technique for any part he has to play.

A chapter on "Playing the Part" draws together the separate threads for weaving the cloth: analyzing the part, imagining it, and playing it. A concluding chapter speaks briefly of the actor's relation on the stage to his fellow-actors and of the designing of the stage picture.

The six chapters mentioned constitute most of what the author has to say on theory, and make up about half the book. The second half is devoted to exercises to parallel the theory. In our opinion the book losses much of its value at this point. Not that exercises should be excluded from a handbook of this kind. But many of *these* might have been omitted without detriment. Some of those on the training of the body are good, notably those prepared by Mrs. Phoebe Baughan Barr. But the exercises for the training of the voice and the reading selections are open to question. And in the vowel chart on p. 67, referred to in this section, two diphthongs are included as pure vowels. The one-act play included as illustrative material for help in preparing and playing a part seems to us distinctly inferior.

Perhaps others will not find a lack of merit in these practice exercises, as we do. If not, then so much the better for them. In any case, to try them will do no harm and probably a great deal of good. We like Mr. Selden's book otherwise, and heartily recommend it for classroom use.

ARTHUR L. WOEHL, *Hunter College*

The System of Basic English. By C. K. OGDEN. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1934; pp. ix, 320; $2.50.

Basic English is a simplified form of normal English which has two chief purposes:

> 1. To serve as an international auxiliary language; that is to say, a second language for use throughout the world in general communication, commerce, and science.
>
> 2. To provide a rational introduction to normal English; both as a first step, complete in itself, for those whose natural language is not English, and as a grammatical introduction, encouraging clarity of thought and expression, for English-speaking peoples at any stage of proficiency.

Its distinctive features are an unusually small vocabulary and small number of grammatical rules.

The vocabulary consists of 850 words—a list short enough to be printed on one side of a sheet of ordinary business stationery and spoken in fifteen minutes. Six hundred of the words are names of

"things," 400 "general" and 200 "picturable"; 150 are names of "qualities"; and the remaining 150 "put these names and adjectives into operation." This vocabulary is sufficient to "cover the needs of everyday life for which a vocabulary of 20,000 words is frequently employed."

In addition to the 850 words of Basic, there are many English words that are already international, like *hotel, telephone, radio,* and *alcohol.* Fifty of these international words "have so far been listed for general use with the Basic system; and each branch of science is allowed its own fifty to enable it to link up with its own internationals." There are but five rules of grammar, with "few and unimportant exceptions."

The means by which the vocabulary is reduced is the cardinal principle of Basic English; namely, the 'elimination' of the verb. Of the 850 words in the Basic vocabulary, only sixteen are verbs, or "operators." The work normally done by other verbs is accomplished by these sixteen with the help of "directives" (prepositions), of which there are twenty. The author explains:

> Take the verb 'enter' for example. It clearly means the same as 'go in.' That is to say, it can be analyzed into the name of an act or movement and the name of a direction or position. So, to climb a tree is to 'go up' a tree, and to descend it is to 'go down.' Basic English gets rid of all those verbs which contain the names of directions [like *enter*], and retains only the fundamental names of acts [like *go*] together with a few other verb-forms [like *may* and *will*] which enable it to complete the job without doing violence to common usage. Thus, for all practical purposes, the verb is eliminated.

The purpose of the volume under consideration is "to present in a connected, and as far as possible a complete, form the System of Basic English for English-speaking readers." The book is in three parts. Part I is a brief introduction which answers the general questions that naturally arise in the mind of a person hearing of Basic for the first time, "whether he be the informed general reader or a Professor of Mathematics," and argues, cogently, the superiority of English—or rather Basic English—as an international language. Part II is a detailed, systematic (though not always lucid) exposition of the structure and methods of Basic English, with practical exercises and problems. Part III (more than half the book) consists of a large number of examples—mainly translations from normal English—drawn from a wide variety of sources: radio speeches, newspaper editorials, business letters, conversation, scientific exposition, the Bible, Shakespeare, H. G. Wells, and so on.

There is an appendix explaining the use of the "Basic Word Wheel," an ingenious device for putting the words of a sentence in their right order. In addition to the general index, there is a separate index to the Basic words. Both the vocabulary and the grammatical rules are conveniently printed on both front and back end-papers. Parts II and III, or all but about thirty pages of the book, are written in Basic, so that the reader has ample opportunity to judge the adequacy of Basic as a medium of communication.

The author explicitly states that the book is not intended as a text for beginners, "though it may form a basis for a school course in the hands of an intelligent teacher." For such a teacher, or indeed any intelligent English-speaking reader, the exposition of the system of Basic English (Part II), though in general sufficiently clear, is sometimes confusing or obscure in details, presumably because of the limitation of vocabulary imposed upon the writer of Basic. In the section explaining how to form new words by adding the endings *-er*, *-ing*, and *-ed*, for instance, the reader may have some difficulty in understanding the meaning of this direction:

> Here are two lists of words. Every word in one list gets the same sort of sense from the addition of the endings as some word in the other list. See which of them go together:
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | pump | polish |
> | fold | roll |
> | ornament | bottle |
> | crush | brush |
> | group | damage |

The limitations of Basic are most clearly revealed in the translations that make up Part III, where a reader accustomed to the much richer vocabulary of normal English will experience a curious feeling of frustration that seems to be due to the necessity for circumlocution. A good illustration of the weakness of Basic as a substitute for normal English is President Roosevelt's radio address on the closing of the banks, which is printed in parallel columns, one giving the speech as it was delivered, the other a translation in Basic English. A count of the number of words on the first two pages (which are typical) shows that what the President said in 315 words required 388, or over 20 per cent more, Basic words. In Basic, too, the speech loses a good deal of its color, vigor, variety, and even accuracy, as suggested by the following excerpt:

As delivered by the President:

It is possible that when the banks resume, a very few people who have not recovered from their fear may again begin withdrawals. Let me make it clear to you that the banks will take care of all needs—except, of course, the hysterical demands of hoarders—and it is my belief that hoarding during the past week has become an exceedingly unfashionable pastime. (64 words)

The Basic translation:

It is possible that when the banks get back to business a small number of persons who have not got over their fear may again take their money away. Let me make it clear to you that the banks will take care of all needs—but, naturally, they will not give way to those who are so unbalanced as to be putting money away secretly; and it is my belief that public opinion about such secret stores has been very much changed in the past week. (86 words)

The limitations of the system as a vehicle for the communication of complex or subtle thought and feeling could doubtless be more emphatically demonstrated by the translation into Basic of highly imaginative poetry. It is nevertheless surprising to discover how much can be said, and said well, with the limited vocabulary of Basic. It must be remembered, moreover, that Basic English is not intended to serve as a substitute for normal English. As an international auxiliary language it would indeed be exceedingly useful, especially because its simplicity would make it easy to master in a short time. And for the same reason it would serve as an excellent foundation for a foreigner who wished to learn English. Mr. Ogden estimates that "it is possible for anyone whose language is not too remote from English to *read* anything written in Basic in less than thirty hours," and cites as an illustration of the ease with which one may learn to *speak* Basic the progress of some Danish pupils in Copenhagen who "went on the air, to the satisfaction of the authorities, after about fifty hours with the system."

To the teacher of speech or of English, to the psychologist, and to others concerned with the relationship between thought and language, Basic English will perhaps be of greatest interest as "a grammatical introduction, encouraging clarity of thought and expression, for English-speaking peoples." Its special virtue as a means to this end lies in its rational, scientific structure, as illustrated by the distinction, already explained earlier in this review, between verbs that contain the names of directions and those that contain only the names of fundamental acts, and by the classification of the parts of speech according to their function. It provides, that is, a rational substitute for the formal rules of old-fashioned grammar, and "its emphasis on the purpose of words rather than on purely formal structure

gives it a unique educational value as an approach to linguistic problems."

The book ends, appropriately, with a translation in Basic of a passage from H. G. Well's prophecy, *The Shape of Things to Come*, which is interesting both as a commentary on the present state of development of Basic English and as a forecast of its possible influence on the language of the future.

GUY S. GREENE, *Iowa State College*

The Best English: A Claim for the Superiority of Received Standard English Together with Notes on Mrs. Gladstone's Pronunciation. By H. L. WYLD. New York: Oxford University Press, 1934; $1.00.

Here is a publication whose great importance is all out of proportion to its small size. If the reader desires a most forceful demonstration of the social significance of language forms, he is advised to read this latest utterance of the Society for the Purification of English, called S.P.E. Tract No. XXXIX. It is not that Mr. Wyld intended it to demonstrate anything of the sort; but it is quite possible that in America its unconscious reflection of the connection between caste and speech habits will bring to this little treatise more genuine interest and attention than the conscious attempt on the part of the author to show why this speech is superior from a phonetic point of view to the speech of certain others. After reading the tract one wonders whether in the depth of their souls the members of the organization issuing this document really want to purify the English of The Isles. After all, they would lose a distinct advantage. After spending a better part of a century in building into the "inferior classes" the mechanism for instant, respectful, and deferential attention at the sound of "cultured speech," why should the S.P.E. try to teach all classes to speak alike? That would be disastrous! Why, the poor tradesfolk would frighten each other to death at first. The father would mistake his own son for the rector; and the housewife would be addressing the plumber as "Major." Then after they had gotten over the shock of it all, the "best folks" no longer would make them tremble. The "lower classes" could look even the members of the S.P.E. squarely in the face as equals. Dreadful!

But the safety-catch in the matter is that, according to Mr. Wyld, those who attempt to imitate their betters cannot achieve the *Received*

Standard (R.S.) *English*, but only produce a sort of a hybrid speech that has no social standing, which our author calls *Modified Standard*. This is "the result of an attempt to speak the 'best' or 'standard' English by those who have not had the advantage of hearing and speaking it from childhood up. It is indeed 'standard' gone wrong, and modified . . . by an inferior *class dialect* . . . (Class is here used in the ordinary sense of grade or section of society)."

"Everyone knows," declares Mr. Wyld, "that there is a kind of English which is neither provincial nor vulgar, a type which most people would willingly speak if they could, and desire to speak if they do not. I suggest that this is the best kind of English, not only because it is spoken by those often very properly called 'the best people,' but because it has two great advantages that make it intrinsically superior to every other type of English speech—the extent to which it is current throughout the country, and the marked distinctiveness and clarity of its sounds."

In defining the R.S., Mr. Wyld continues by declaring that it is not Oxford English. That he reluctantly classifies as "a form of *Modified Standard*." He warns Americans about making the mistake that Dr. Vizetelly made in confusing *Oxford voice* and *Standard English*. He says that the gentleman "seems to have been unfortunate in the speakers he selected for observation, and to have been misled into accepting as 'the best people' those who were actually something quite different." It seems that Dr. Vizetelly did not have the right letters of introduction.

"Nowhere," says Mr. Wyld, "does the best that is in English culture find a fairer expression than in R.S. speech . . . If I were asked among what class the 'best' English is most constantly heard at its best, I think, on the whole, I should say among Officers of British Regular Army." Has England come to that? The soldier class superior to the clergy?

He defines R. S. negatively by giving a few horrible examples of what it is not. "Some time ago," he laments, "I listened in to a speaker, a noble lord I regret to say, broadcasting his belief that there was still a 'stight of dinejer' in the political atmosphere of Europe." He speaks with considerable consternation also of another radio speaker "who referred again and again to a railway as a 'ryoowy' and constantly said *due to* when he meant *on account of* or *owing to*—'we could not fly low *due to* the numerous high mountain peaks.'"

One characteristic of good speech is sonority, says Mr. Wyld,

gives it a unique educational value as an approach to linguistic problems."

The book ends, appropriately, with a translation in Basic of a passage from H. G. Well's prophecy, *The Shape of Things to Come*, which is interesting both as a commentary on the present state of development of Basic English and as a forecast of its possible influence on the language of the future.

GUY S. GREENE, *Iowa State College*

The Best English: A Claim for the Superiority of Received Standard English Together with Notes on Mrs. Gladstone's Pronunciation. By H. L. WYLD. New York: Oxford University Press, 1934; $1.00.

Here is a publication whose great importance is all out of proportion to its small size. If the reader desires a most forceful demonstration of the social significance of language forms, he is advised to read this latest utterance of the Society for the Purification of English, called S.P.E. Tract No. XXXIX. It is not that Mr. Wyld intended it to demonstrate anything of the sort; but it is quite possible that in America its unconscious reflection of the connection between caste and speech habits will bring to this little treatise more genuine interest and attention than the conscious attempt on the part of the author to show why this speech is superior from a phonetic point of view to the speech of certain others. After reading the tract one wonders whether in the depth of their souls the members of the organization issuing this document really want to purify the English of The Isles. After all, they would lose a distinct advantage. After spending a better part of a century in building into the "inferior classes" the mechanism for instant, respectful, and deferential attention at the sound of "cultured speech," why should the S.P.E. try to teach all classes to speak alike? That would be disastrous! Why, the poor tradesfolk would frighten each other to death at first. The father would mistake his own son for the rector; and the housewife would be addressing the plumber as "Major." Then after they had gotten over the shock of it all, the "best folks" no longer would make them tremble. The "lower classes" could look even the members of the S.P.E. squarely in the face as equals. Dreadful!

But the safety-catch in the matter is that, according to Mr. Wyld, those who attempt to imitate their betters cannot achieve the *Received*

Standard (R.S.) *English*, but only produce a sort of a hybrid speech that has no social standing, which our author calls *Modified Standard*. This is "the result of an attempt to speak the 'best' or 'standard' English by those who have not had the advantage of hearing and speaking it from childhood up. It is indeed 'standard' gone wrong, and modified . . . by an inferior *class dialect* . . . (Class is here used in the ordinary sense of grade or section of society)."

"Everyone knows," declares Mr. Wyld, "that there is a kind of English which is neither provincial nor vulgar, a type which most people would willingly speak if they could, and desire to speak if they do not. I suggest that this is the best kind of English, not only because it is spoken by those often very properly called 'the best people,' but because it has two great advantages that make it intrinsically superior to every other type of English speech—the extent to which it is current throughout the country, and the marked distinctiveness and clarity of its sounds."

In defining the R.S., Mr. Wyld continues by declaring that it is not Oxford English. That he reluctantly classifies as "a form of *Modified Standard*." He warns Americans about making the mistake that Dr. Vizetelly made in confusing *Oxford voice* and *Standard English*. He says that the gentleman "seems to have been unfortunate in the speakers he selected for observation, and to have been misled into accepting as 'the best people' those who were actually something quite different." It seems that Dr. Vizetelly did not have the right letters of introduction.

"Nowhere," says Mr. Wyld, "does the best that is in English culture find a fairer expression than in R.S. speech . . . If I were asked among what class the 'best' English is most constantly heard at its best, I think, on the whole, I should say among Officers of British Regular Army." Has England come to that? The soldier class superior to the clergy?

He defines R. S. negatively by giving a few horrible examples of what it is not. "Some time ago," he laments, "I listened in to a speaker, a noble lord I regret to say, broadcasting his belief that there was still a 'stight of dinejer' in the political atmosphere of Europe." He speaks with considerable consternation also of another radio speaker "who referred again and again to a railway as a 'ryoowy' and constantly said *due to* when he meant *on account of* or *owing to*—'we could not fly low *due to* the numerous high mountain peaks.' "

One characteristic of good speech is sonority, says Mr. Wyld.

Sonority is beauty. R.S. has a fair share of sonorous sounds, "more, I fancy, than any single provincial dialect. Chief of these is the sound popularly expressed by *ah* as heard in *path, chaff, task, hard,* etc . . . In some dialects the vowel is short, and even if nearly the same in actual quality, this short vowel lacks the solidity and dignity of the R.S. sound." It probably lacks the military ring. Mr. Wyld indulges himself in an orgy of self-inflicted and yet delicious torture when he says, "Imagine Keats' *Thou wast not born for death, immortal bird,* with the final rhyming word pronounced either with a trilled or 'inverted' *r*!" I should imagine such an offender might be sent to a distant army post on the Island of Hopi-Hopi to avoid contaminating the rest of the gentlemen at the officers' table.

"I believe no unbiased listener would hesitate," Mr. Wyld admits freely, "in preferring R.S. as the most pleasing and sonorous form." After an analysis of the phonetic difference between R.S. and various inferior forms of English, he says that he has "established the claim that R.S. is intrinsically superior to other types of English." This claim is an ambitious one. It seems to this reviewer that, on the basis of a premise that sonority equals beauty (not a hard premise to accept), he has established his thesis; but that in his attempt to make his point that R.S. contains a more clearly distinguishable vowel system, he has not been so convincing. But, dear Reader, please get the tract. You will like it.

R. WEST, *University of Wisconsin*

The Year Book of College Oratory, Volume VI. COMPILED BY EVAN A. ANDERSON. New York: Noble and Noble, 1934; pp. xxiii, 366; $2.

The purpose and scope of this series of annuals is well enough known to make any word about them unnecessary. The present volume contains thirty-three orations, representative of thirty-five oratorical associations. To pass objective judgment upon relative merits of the speeches here included is quite out of the question. It seems certain, to this reviewer, at least, that some of these orations would place high in any contest, if presented with reasonably effective delivery, while others could have won their contests only because of the greater mediocrity of the competitors, or because of exceptional delivery.

Professor Anderson has summarized the principal themes: 1). The truth must flow freely at all times. 2). The delegation of powers

to non-elected officials will jeopardize representative government. 3). The "Middle Class" must be preserved at all costs. 4). "Rugged Individualism" must pass. 5). False economies have created a crisis in education. 6). Private profits must be taken out of War and Preparedness,—the munitions maker being "the *chief de resistance* in the 1934 College Oratory Feast." 7). The egress of moral and religious ideals in American life must be viewed with apprehension. The scope and pertinency of these themes are ample indication that students are alert to problems of today. In the main, the treatment of these problems is up-to-date, both in factual material and in outlook. Now and then, one of our current social myths is given credence, such as that which praises Henry Ford as "a champion of a square deal for labor"; but only once are we reminded of the glory, and the shame, of Babylonia, Egypt, Greece, and Rome.

With the breadth, vigor, and liberality of view expressed, no one can find much fault. But one may be impressed by a significant tendency in the development of these views, namely, that whereas the orators have been keenly analytic in exploring their problem and bold in exposing what they find, they are not often able to propose a solution equally concrete and pertinent. The causes and evils of war, for example, are set forth with a freshness and force hardly to be expected of a theme so constantly in use. The treatment is realistic, courageous, and compelling with the force of skillfully emotionalized facts. But the proposals for ridding the world of war usually drift off into pleas for education, "advertizing this hell," and instilling the ideal of peace in the minds and hearts of men. Even when the economic roots of war have been exposed, there is no thorough attempt to follow the implications of this exposure, and to deal with the inevitability of war in a world organized on the economic basis of our present civilization. The same tendency can be felt in the treatment of the crisis in education: the exposures should shame a Huey Long, but realistic and concrete proposals for removing education from the hands of our spoils-system, and for establishing education in a more clearly defined function in our society are lacking, or thinly treated.

I am not sure that this criticism should be directed at the students who wrote these orations. Rather, this tendency would seem to indicate simply that students are moved by the general current of thought about them. Our public efforts at solving problems are full of instances in which we oppose facts with solutions made chiefly

of hypnotic emotion. Upon this tendency, the closing paragraph of the first oration in the volume serves as commentary:

> If the undergraduate is to realize the promise of his privileges, it will not be by violating his integrity with immature crusades, but by submission to the discipline of disinterested analysis. It is in their inability or unwillingness to grasp this fundamental truth that lies the chief count aganst our incipient revolutionaries.

The style of the speeches is uneven, though, for the most part, the composition is direct and cogent. An interesting departure from the sonority and periods of the older tradition is employed in the speech, "The Road to Prosperity." Some conventionalities appear: the audience is greeted, cajoled, and challenged as "my friends," with uncomfortable frequency; but only rare use is made of "the pages of history," "maelstroms," and "seething caldrons." The casualties of the world war are paraded twice—perhaps they are still marching since this parade was first set off,—and the stereotyped figures of "open doors" and "game-teamwork" appear once each. There appear, too, the conventional traffic signals of "Let us look more deeply," and "Let us examine." Neither conventionalities, nor the license of oral prose can excuse some of the indefinite references of pronouns, and the incomplete predications.

The volume encourages one to feel that the practice of oratory in our colleges and universities goes on with vigor and fruitful thinking. If there is any regret awakened, it is that so many of these orations, one suspects, are never heard outside the reverberating, often half-empty halls where the contests take place. The public, and especially the faculties, might hear with profit what students think and feel about the problems of our times.

JOHN L. CASTEEL, *University of Oregon*

Preachers Present Arms. By RAY H. ABRAMS. New York: Round Table Press, 1933; pp. xix, 297.

It is characteristic of rhetoric that it serves indifferently both sides of any question, to the greater utility of the art but sometimes to the greater ruin of the artist. If, in 1917 and 1918, the clergy had been unable to turn their oratory from the preaching of peace and brotherhood to the uses of war, they would very likely have found themselves dispensed with. Being able to do so, they found themselves glorified, for the time, as agents of the government and chief propagandists to the respectable mob. Three years after the

Armistice they could review their success, in the words of *The Churchman* quoted by Dr. Abrams: "We hated as our Governments bade us hate. We spread lies about our enemies as those lies were meted out to us in official propaganda. We taught unforgiveness even as our rulers and diplomats inspired us to do." Rhetoric is still serving them well in proclaiming their repentance. It will serve them equally well when there is occasion to interpret another "holy war" to their congregations.

Dr. Abrams prefixes to one of his chapters Nathaniel Hawthorne's famous words on witchcraft: " . . . that terrible delusion, which should teach us . . . that the influential classes, and those who take upon themselves to be leaders of the people, are fully liable to all the passionate error that has ever characterized the maddest mob. Clergymen, judges, statesmen—the wisest, calmest, holiest persons of their days—stood in the inner circle round about the gallows, loudest to applaud the work of blood, latest to confess themselves miserably deceived."

Dr. Abrams does not adopt this as a text and argue it. But if ever such a broad generalization could be demonstrated, he demonstrates this one, so far as the clergy are concerned, as he dispassionately, methodically assembles the answers to his inquiry: "How did the forces of social control affect institutionalized religion and its leadership, and how did these religious institutions, in turn, serve as agents of social control?"

The reaction of the preachers to war propaganda was a mass reaction. With few exceptions, the differences among individuals were merely gradations of subtlety in rationalizing and degrees of eloquence in passing on the standard materials to their religiously conditioned audiences. Lyman Abbott could draw proofs from Jesus' telling Peter to put up his sword. "By this rebuke of Peter," said Dr. Abbott, "he sanctioned the right of the police to use force in the execution of the law." Just so, the use of force against Germany by the Allied police. Others were limited to simpler processes, such as Harold Bell Wright's assurance that "a thirty-centimeter gun may voice the edict of God as truly as the notes of a cooing dove . . . The sword of America is the sword of Jesus." Canned sermon outlines, illustrations, and texts were available to preachers whose hearts were in the cause but whose heads lacked these resources.

Here and there Dr. Abrams points out the identity of the preachers' exhortations and the alleged infamies of the Germans. Thus it was urged that "We must help in the bayoneting of a normally decent

German soldier in order to free him from a tyranny which he at present accepts as his chosen form of government," while it was held a special iniquity of the Germans that they believed in "forcibly imposing of one's own culture upon another people because of its avowed superiority." A pastor might well declare that democracy "is the divine order of society" but between that and a parallel assertion by a German lay all the difference between revelation and blasphemy.

Again, while it was universal among the preachers to appropriate God's support to their own side, one of them could say of the same philosophy, when attributed to the Kaiser, "This thought of divine favoritism looks strange indeed in the light of the twentieth century. We expect to find it among uncivilized peoples; it is part of the narrow intellectual outlook of barbarians . . ." Likewise, atrocity stories were among the favorite materials for stimulating religious hatred of the enemy; but among the proposals of the clergy for dealing with the Kaiser there was an inspired variety of tortures. When a clergyman did call "attention to some of our own national sins—broken treaties, labor conditions, and race prejudice," and said that "as a nation we had condemned Germany for some things of which we also were guilty," he was denounced as a pro-German pacifist in spite of his full support of the war.

Indeed, the religious-rhetorical mind could sometimes outdistance the military and the official mind in the desertion of reason and decency. General Pershing recalled a sergeant who had been contributing atrocity stories to a Liberty Loan campaign, for no alleged reason but that they were false. But an assembly of preachers passed a vote of censure of a speaker who told of some pleasant experiences in German prison camps, for the reason that "such talk poisons the minds of the people and might cause them to doubt the stories of cruelty and barbarity . . ." An official request was made of the four-minute men, including the preachers who made up a large portion of the group, to eliminate "hymns of hate" and similar appeals. The Rev. Newell Dwight Hillis supported a proposal for "simply exterminating the German people" by "the sterilization of 10,000,000 German soldiers and the segregation of the women." A conscientious objector wrote that "their most bitter and intolerant enemies in the army were the chaplains and the Y.M.C.A. men." Even the Department of Justice lagged behind the exhortations of many of the preachers in the treatment of "traitors," who, in the words of Henry Van Dyke, put "destructive material into the minds

of our American citizens" and therefore, according to the sage of Princeton, "should be hung without delay."

There are exceptions to all of this—a few individuals, John Haynes Holmes, Norman Thomas, Paul Jones, and others less well known, and a few sects. Dr. Abrams gives the exceptions as careful attention as he gives the rest. After elaborate investigation he found seventy preachers who had dissented throughout the war, and of these twenty-seven had to leave their pulpits. Perhaps the most eloquent expression of dissent came from John Haynes Holmes in his famous "Statement to My People on the Eve of War." Germans were not denounced more ferociously by the war clergy than were these few dissenters.

Of course the excerpts which Dr. Abrams gives from the multitude of sermons and writings that he cites are too short to show much of the technique of the individual masterpieces by which the preachers served "as agents of social control." They show that sex and economics were used to reinforce the will of God as sources of persuasion. They show the interchangeability of the symbols of religion and the symbols of nationalism. They show the ease with which the premises of religion can be turned to produce conclusions identical with those of the most irreligious premises. But most importantly, they show how orators can lead others into folly and delusion with exactly the same means by which they were themselves so led.

V. E. SIMRELL, *Dartmouth College*

Winning Debates, Orations and Speeches of Pi Kappa Delta. Vol. V. COMPILED BY GEORGE W. FINLEY. New York: Noble and Noble, 1934; pp. x, 220. $2.

Sixty-eight teams of women and 120 teams of men debated the "Extension of the Powers of the President" in separate debate tournaments. Forty women and seventy-two men entered the oratorical contests. Forty-three women gave extempore talks on various phases of "Women's Place in Modern Civilization." Seventy-six men spoke extemporaneously on specific topics concerning "Agriculture in America." All this in five days of eloquence at the Tenth Biennial Convention of Pi Kappa Delta, national honorary forensic society, held at Lexington, Kentucky in April, 1934. This volume contains the final debates of both men and women, and the orations

and extempore speeches which won first, second and third prizes in the contests.

The debates of both men and women are excellent examples of the survival of the fittest. The clash is clear and continued. The speakers are logical, well informed, and alert.

The women seem to have written the better orations. As usual, the orators are impatient with the world of their elders and talk of "an indictment of our present order," and "gazing into a hopeless future." In their anxiety to make the indictment strong and the present as well as the future hopeless, they are tempted to make errors of fact and hasty generalization. Apparently, the mid-western speaker who spoke of certain conditions as those of the "average college" and claimed that "the richer a college is in equipment and faculty, the harder it is hit by the depression" has had little contact with some of our more famous institutions. Any college, however, might well be proud of the straightforward and effective manner in which the orators present their indictments.

In the extempore contests, all but the winner for the men clung to their rather drab assigned topics, and gave good but dull speeches. The last speaker successfully avoided his topic with the substitutions of the only bits of humor in the record of five long days of earnest and solemn discussion, and received the grateful award of the judges.

No doubt all of the participating chapters have ordered the book as a record of an outstanding event. It affords an opportunity to study the simplest, direct manner in which modern college speakers analyse and present their conclusions on some of the most discussed topics of the day.

BROOKS QUIMBY, *Bates College*

The Silver Treasury. COMPILED AND EDITED BY JANE MANNER. New York: Samuel French, 1934; pp. xiii, 404; $3.

A more accurate title for this book would be, *Jane Manner's Programs, or What I Have Successfully Presented to Audiences.* She began compiling notebooks at the age of eleven, and has continued to collect bits of verse and prose throughout her career as a teacher and professional reader. Some pieces seem to have been retained from very early notebooks, in which she omitted references to sources. Others have been included because of affection for the authors. Hence anyone who approaches this volume with the notion that it represents

an ordered, systematic attempt to make available the passages in English literature best suited to oral interpretation will come away disillusioned. To Miss Manner an anthology is a collection of flowers, and she has plucked these blooms herself.

The reader should not be surprised, therefore, to encounter such blossoms as

> He scribbles poems against the sky
> With a gay, leafy lettering,
> For us and for our bettering.

and

> I grabbed my bag from off the shelf,
> I fairly lost my reason;
> Oh Boy! What joy! I was to have
> The first game of the season.

along with a chorus from Aristophanes and a liberal allowance of Shakespeare.

The real significance of the book lies in what it says by implication about the taste of the American audience; and here Miss Manner is an automatic expert. Disregarding Anonymous for the moment, our favorite authors in America are Shakespeare and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, with Robert Browning a close third and William Wordsworth, Alfred Tennyson, and Charles Dickens still in the running. We remember Keats, and can occasionally stand a snatch from Emerson, Matthew Arnold, and Leigh Hunt. But we are through with Kipling, and have never heard of Robert Frost, Vachel Lindsay, Carl Sandburg, or any other important modern American poet. Nor, heaven be praised, do we relish Edgar Guest, although some of his imitators now and then take our fancy.

Our favorite topics for programs of oral reading are "All in a Garden Fair," "The Call of the Open," "Moonlight Garden Recital," "An Hour with Dan Cupid," "Friendship and Fellowship," "Music and Art in Literature," scenes from Ibsen, Chekhov, Sheridan, Sophocles, and others, "A Children's Hour," "In Lighter Vein," "Inspiration and Courage," "Shakespeare Scenes," several miscellaneous one-act plays, and a special program for house-warming.

Happily, most of the selections are better than Miss Manner's program titles, and the teacher of speech who browses through the volume will recognize with delight many old favorites not otherwise easily accessible and discover a considerable number of new offerings with high literary quality as well as (to use Robert Underwood Johnson's word, coined in the Preface) readaloudability. The bio-

graphical notes may be safely ignored, unless one really must be told that Poe "had a brilliant mind" and that Shakespeare is still "without a peer."

RAYMOND F. HOWES, *Washington University*

Saints, Sinners and Beechers. By LYMAN BEECHER STOWE. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1934; p. 450.

You may have seen the chapters on Lyman Beecher in the *Atlantic Monthly* last autumn. The rest of the material has never been published before in this form, but the student of the Beecher family will recognize much of the biographical data. Because he is a member of the family (Mr. Stowe is a grandson of Harriett Beecher Stowe) there is many a family anecdote that heretofore has not been published. A gentle humor pervades the book. The author says, "Who knows whether the Beechers were good and great? I don't but I do know they were amusing, lovable and outrageous."

Quite properly, in proportioning the space Henry Ward receives the lion's share, Harriet Beecher Stowe receives the next largest, and Catherine, an early protagonist of education for women, gets the next largest. William Henry Beecher; Edward Beecher, once president of Illinois College, where William Jennings Bryan attended; Mary Foote Beecher; Charles Beecher; Isabella Beecher, the suffragist; Thomas K. Beecher, builder of the first institutional church at Elmira, N. Y., and James Beecher all receive a chapter or two.

Five chapters are devoted to Harriet Beecher Stowe. The material in the chapter on "The Building of Uncle Tom's Cabin" will insure the book's usefulness if nothing else does. Students of the American novel will find this chapter invaluable.

This is the first time all the Beechers have been brought together within the confines of one book. It was a splendid thing to do. The fifty-odd illustrations, got together with no little pains and patience, enhance the value of the book. My students of oratory, when we come to Henry Ward Beecher, will give to Mr. Stowe a vote of thanks for this interesting book. I do not see how any college library or any teacher of the history of American oratory can get along without it.

LIONEL CROCKER, *Denison University*

The Francis Preston Blair Family in Politics. By WILLIAM ERNEST SMITH, in two volumes. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933; pp. xi, 516, vii, 523; $7.50 per set.

Professor Smith's work has been enthusiastically praised by historians, and there can be little doubt that he has thrown a bright, if hardly brilliant, light into many hitherto dark corners of American politics. He might have been more daring than merely to state that "Francis Preston Blair and his two sons, Francis Preston and Montgomery, are representatives of a longer period of influence in American politics than any other family except the Adams family," for the Blairs, during their fifty years of activity, held high offices and wielded tremendous influence. The elder Francis, as editor of the Washington *Globe* and member of the famous "Kitchen Cabinet," served as the mouthpiece and often the brain of Andrew Jackson; the younger Francis became not only a major-general during the Civil War but a member of the U. S. Senate and candidate for the Vice-Presidency; and Montgomery, as Lincoln's Postmaster-General, had an important part in shaping national policies on war and reconstruction.

The careers of these three giants and of several lesser relatives are chronicled in great detail. But these volumes will nevertheless be disappointing to students of rhetoric, because Professor Smith is so occupied with the *what* that he seldom tells the *how*. It is obvious that the elder Blair had rhetorical ability of a high order; otherwise he would have been useless to Jackson either as a journalist or a political adviser. Both the sons, too, were noted orators and controversial writers. But the methods they used and the sources of their power seem not to interest Professor Smith. It is enough for his purpose to indicate, with a few quoted sentences and several footnotes, that Frank took a certain stand and triumphed. This is perhaps sufficient for the preliminary historical record; it cannot be accepted as the final story of three men who won high distinction by the use of the spoken and written word.

RAYMOND F. HOWES, *Washington University*

Medical Economics. By BROOKS QUIMBY. Newton, Mass.: Pollak Foundation for Economic Research, 1934; pp. 31, 5 cents.

This pamphlet, which contains reading lists and briefs on a subject of increasing national importance, is an attempt to bring medical economics forward as a topic for intercollegiate debate. The venture deserves success.

R. F. H.

OLD BOOKS

The Exhibition Speaker: containing Farces, Dialogues, and Tableaux, with Exercises for Declamation in Prose and Verse. Also, a Treatise on Oratory and Elocution, Hints on Dramatic Characters, Costumes, Position on the Stage, Making Up, Etc. Etc. To which is added a Complete System of Calisthenics and Gymnastics. By P. A. FITZGERALD. New York: Sheldon and Company, 1866; pp. 268.

As the title-page shows, there is something here for everyone. Students of dramatic history (and particularly of the history of educational dramatics) will be interested in the frontispiece, which may be the earliest American picture we have (does anyone know an earlier?) of a school play in progress. It shows the improvised stage extending into the schoolroom, fitted with footlights (and one pendant lamp) and with a center-draw curtain, pulled back at either side. The only entrance is from backstage. It is a box set, the drape curtains serving for teaser and tormentor. Properties are a table and two chairs, with some pictures on the back wall. Three schoolboy actors are on, one of them seated at the table with pen and ink before him. Perhaps the other two represent father and son, pleading with the miserly capitalist to renew the mortgage. Every seat in the schoolroom is occupied, and there are a few extra chairs placed at the back and people standing in the aisle. The title is "The School Exhibition—Plan of Stage."

The same student will be interested when he turns to the specimens of drama here offered for school use. The first is "A Race for a Dinner, a Farce in One Act," author unnamed, but evidently a relic from eighteenth-century or early nineteenth-century England. The second is "Hob and Nob, a Romance of real Life, in One Act," by Madison Norton; then come "Love in Humble Life, a Petite Comedy in One Act" by the better known John Howard Payne, and "Three Eras in the Life of a Farmer's Son, a Domestic Drama in Three Acts," by Author Fitzgerald himself. These modern plays are followed by selected scenes from *Hamlet* and *Richard III*, Sheridan Knowles's *Love*, Bulwer-Lytton's *Money*, and Mayne Reid's *Love's Martyr*, with a "Dialogue on the Subject of Exhibition Day,"

again by Author Fitzgerald. This last-named piece is a jocular argument, with serious intent, proving that exhibition day provides excellent training for life, because it gives the student an opportunity to develop his powers as a speaker. For example, Will asks, "Is the art of public speaking a branch of education?" and John answers, "I think it is. How would you get along if you were called upon to make a stump speech?"

There are also included some impressive *tableaux vivants*, with words and directions complete, as well as a few oratorical and poetical selections. As will be seen, this book is addressed to schools in which there was little or no instruction in public speaking or elocution, but in which the "school exhibition" gave an opportunity to the pupils to practice the arts and crafts of speech. The copy I picked up in a second-hand book store was owned in 1872 by George W. Dawes of Ypsilanti, Michigan. Pencilled initials opposite the *dramatis personae* indicate that Fitzgerald's *Three Eras in the Life of a Farmer's Son* was presented. "G. D." played "George, the Farmer's Son." Hence, the historian of education dramatics is furnished with the title and text of a school play presented at Ypsilanti, *c.* 1872, and possibly with the name of one of the actors.

Other readers may be more interested in Fitzgerald's discussion of elocution, including elementary sounds, voice, gesture, general precepts, and "description of stage" (under which title occur the two pages of instruction concerning make-up). Fitzgerald quotes "Mr. Sheridan's rules for reciting verse," four in number, and among his general precepts he states, something very much needed by young speakers, that the speaker "may form a judgment concerning the opinion of his audience by the degree of their attention." He gives little attention to public speaking, as distinguished from declamation and dramatics, except to enforce its importance to the individual and to the state.

HOYT H. HUDSON, *Princeton University*

A Manual of the Art of Prose Composition. BY J. M. BONNELL, D.D. Louisville: John P. Morton and Company, 1867.

Students who follow the historic development of textbooks dealing with speech will be interested in Chapters 28, 29, 30, 31, and 34 of this *Manual*.

Chapter 28 considers certain preliminary exercises in reasoning, under the general title, Invention and Argumentation, while Chapter

29 deals with the sources of argument. Six are listed: proofs from (1) Explication or Analysis; (2) Antecedent Probability; (3) Signs or Consequences; (4) Instances or Examples; (5) Analogy; (6) Testimony or Authority.

Chapter 30 is on Euphony and Harmony. Two rules are stated: (1) Avoid all combinations of sounds that are harsh, grating, or unmelodious, and (2) the clauses or members of a sentence should be arranged so as to produce an agreeable impression on the ear.

In Chapter 31, "The Oration," the author says: "Let not, then, the young aspirant trust to the mere inspiration of an occasion, the nature and influence of which he can not foresee. But let him qualify himself by assiduous practice to stand with self-possession before an audience, to think coherently when all eyes are upon him, and to speak in good style, made natural by habit, and thus hold himself ready for the afflatus which an occasion may produce."

He lists as the six formal divisions of a regular oration: (1) The Exordium, or Introduction; (2) The Division, or Arrangement; (3) The Statement; (4) The Reasoning, or Arguments; (5) The Appeal to the Feelings; (6) The Peroration, or Conclusion.

The numerous examples and exercises which are found accompanying each chapter division are of great interest and may provide material for amplifying the present class work.

It is noteworthy that the final chapter is titled "Extemporaneous Composition." In this closing word the author suggests that debating by the class members, either in class or in a "lyceum" which they have organized, is the ultimate outgrowth of a study of the *Manual*. He says: "No course of instruction and discipline in the Art of Prose Composition would be complete without a portion devoted to extemporaneous composition." The long list of suggested debate questions demonstrates the similarity existing between authors and textbooks of today and those of sixty years ago.

L. S. JUDSON, *University of Wisconsin*

IN THE PERIODICALS

TRAVIS, LEE EDWARD and JOHNSON, WENDELL, *Stuttering and the Concept of Handedness.* Psychological Review, XLI, No. 6, November, 1934, 534–562.

In reviewing briefly the studies on the relation between handedness and stuttering, the authors seek to clarify the issues involved in the problem. These issues may be stated as follows:

1. Is there any relation between the onset of stuttering and change of peripheral handedness?

2. Are stutterers as a group different from non-stutterers as a group with respect to peripheral sidedness?

3. Are there differences in the hereditary backgrounds of stutterers and non-stutterers with respect to peripheral aspects of sidedness?

4. Are stutterers as a group different from non-stutterers as a group with respect to central neurological aspects of sidedness?

Considering the pertinent researches on the subject, the authors conclude that

"1. Change of handedness occurs with significant frequency in cases of stuttering . . . .

"2. Stutterers differ significantly from right-handed normal speakers with respect to peripheral sidedness, showing a greater degree of left-laterality and ambilaterality. . . .

"3. There is more left-handedness in the hereditary background of stutterers than of normal speakers. . . .

"4. The central, or cerebral, organization in stutterers is characterized by a high degree of ambilaterality, in contrast to the relatively high degree of unilaterality characteristic of the central or cerebral organization in normal speakers. . . . "

Innate left-handedness in itself is not causally related to stuttering, but "there is reason to believe that on the basis of actual manual habits, however, they are generally more ambidextrous than are right-handed normal speakers."

G. W. G.

STEINBERG, J. C., *The Application of Sound Measuring Instruments to the Study of Phonetic Problems.* Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, VI, 1934, 16–24.

Using an oscillographic record, an analysis was made of the sounds uttered in the sentence, "Joe took father's shoe-bench out." It is shown how variations in the root mean square amplitude of the wave, frequency of the fundamental, and the frequencies of the overtones may be studied.

CASON, HULSEY, *The Role of Verbal Activities in the Conditioning of Human Subjects.* Psychological Review, XLI, No. 6, November, 1934. 563–571.

Conditioned response experiments have not been entirely successful with human subjects, because certain factors have been ignored. The verbal report method has been scorned by some writers, but the author considers it "a mistake to pay no attention at all to their (the subjects) implicit verbal activities."

In certain forms of learning the verbal activities involved in "learning, retention and reproduction" are "more significant than the existence of Gestalt patterns on some occasions."

HOWELLS, T. H. and SCHOOLLAND, J. B.: *An Experimental Study of Speech Perception.* Journal of General Psychology, II, No. 2, October, 1934. 336–347.

It has been generally assumed that all auditory defects are acuity defects: instruments for the measurement of acuity are called "audiometers." It has also been rather taken for granted that inability to hear speech is due mainly to lack of acuity.

In order to test the validity of this hypothesis a special test was devised and given to 110 students. Little correspondence is shown between speech perception and reliable measurements of auditory acuity, nor between speech perception and such tests as facial memory, ability to read blurred print, spelling, or the Seashore Tests of Musical Aptitudes.

Acuity has probably "been overestimated as a factor in hearing," and "more attention should be paid to the auditory function as a totality."

G. W. G.

FLEMMING, EDWIN G., *The Nature of Interesting Conversation.* The English Journal, XXIII, No. 8, October, 1934, 636–639.

DONNELLY, FRANCIS P., *Humor: A Denatured Fallacy.* Thought (New York), IX, No. 2, September, 1934, 286–295.

GREEN, O. M., *Pidgin-English. The Fortnightly* (London), No. 813, New Series, September, 1934, 331–340.

In order to answer the question "What is the quality of those persons who are interesting in conversation?" the teachers of 84 students in an Eastern high school for girls "were given lists of forty-six items, including 'interesting in conversation,' and asked to check for each girl each item that would characterize her." The object was to determine "not only which girls were interesting in conversation but also to what extent each of the other items was associated with interestingness in conversation." The degree of association was determined "by means of the coefficient of contingency. . . . "

The results tended to show that whereas there was "no association between interestingness in conversation and good nature, excitability, modesty, loyalty, courtesy, sympathy, fairness, smiling countenance, or beauty," there was a "definite and positive association with sense of humor, amusing, individuality, well-informed, wide interests, intelligent, lively, competent, clever, cultured and original."

Professor Donnelly proposes to show "that humor is the outcome of a harmless fallacy."

> For pleasure of any living power there must be activity of the power. . . The mind. . . will act pleasantly if reality or truth is presented. But in humor there is deformity, an element of unreality, which normally would cause pain. Remove the element of pain, and you have the Aristotelian formula of humor, 'painless incongruity.' In what process of the mind are these elements found? In the fallacy, which by appearing to be true starts the mind toward the pleasure of truth, but in its final outcome causes pain. . . Humor has the appearance of concluding but does not conclude.

Specimens of humor, classifiable as fallacies of division, composition, equivocation, and the like, are presented to support the thought position.

Mr. Green, for many years a resident of China, observes that the "essence of pidgin is that pronunciation is modified to help the struggles of the Chinese tongue with certain foreign consonants; while, in imitation of Chinese idiom, there is neither inflection nor conjugation." Pidgin was no doubt invented before the English came to China; the Portuguese influence was at one time reasonably

important. Present day pidgin varies greatly in different districts. In Peking it is hardly spoken at all while in Canton, "classic home of pidgin," it still flourishes, perhaps because Cantonese is for foreigners a very difficult tone language.

Mr. Green disagrees with those sinologues who believe pidgin should disappear. "For my part, pidgin-English is certainly one of the many things to which should be applied Lord Melbourne's maxim, 'Why can't you let it alone?'" "In some indefinable way one associates pidgin-English with all that is most endearing in the Chinese nature: their love of mirth, good-fellowship and readiness to live and let live."

LESTER THONSSEN, *College of the City of New York*

VOELKER, CHARLES H.; *ði ɔkr:ɔnsɔz ɔv sawndz in fɔrməl ɔmɛrəkən iŋglis.* Le Maitre Phonétique, Juillet-Septembre, 1934, 73–74.

This paper, written in an I.P.A. transcription of a colloquial pronunciation which might occur in the neighborhood of Columbus, Ohio, U.S.A., discusses how frequently each phonetic element occurs relatively in connected American usage.

NEWS AND NOTES

[Please send items for this department to Miss Lousene Rousseau, 49 East 33rd Street, New York City.]

The second annual convention of the Central States Speech Association was held at Northwestern University on April 27th and 28th. This Association draws its membership from Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. The following program was presented:

General Session, Friday afternoon

Greeting to the Convention, President Walter Dill Scott, Northwestern University.

"Direct and Indirect Methods of Teaching Speech," Gladys Borchers, University of Wisconsin.

"The Speech Deficient," William Sanford, University of Illinois.

Section on Drama

This section included demonstrations presented by the Northwestern University Theatre as examples of certain theories of production, and discussions of these, led by John Baird and Lee Mitchell.

Section on Debate

"Radio Debating," Lyman S. Judson, University of Wisconsin.

"Debate Judging," Martin S. Holcomb, Augustana College.

"Framing the Proposition," A. Craig Baird, University of Iowa.

"And 'and' Shall be no More," C. C. Cunningham, Northwestern University.

Section on Phonetics

"History of Recording Apparatus," Karl Windesheim, University of Wisconsin.

"The Stimulation Method in the Treatment of Articulatory Defects," Bessie Rasmus, University of Iowa.

Drama Section, Saturday morning

Demonstrations were given by groups of school children of Creative Dramatics for the Junior High School, illustrating the beginning of dramatization, class criticism, the building of a scene, and the development of versatility by changing from one character to another. The discussion following the demonstrations was led by Winifred Ward, of Northwestern University.

Debate Section

The Saturday morning debate section consisted of demonstrations of debate strategy and techniques by Northwestern University students, showing the analysis of a question, comprehensive rebuttal, handling of statistics, and development

of issues. The only paper of the section was on "Debate Tournaments," by George Beauchamp, Manchester College.

INTERPRETATION

This section was devoted to a demonstration of a new set-up for the declamatory contest, with high school speakers. The discussion was led by Ralph Dennis, Dean of the Northwestern University School of Speech.

SPEECH CORRECTION

"Hearing Defects and Speech," Robert W. West, University of Wisconsin.
"Handedness, Sidedness, and Disabilities," Bryng Bryngelson, University of Minnesota.

Saturday afternoon and evening were devoted to the Interstate Oratorical Association contests. New officers elected were: Harry G. Barnes, University of Iowa, President; C. R. Layton, Muskingum College, Secretary-Treasurer. The next meeting of the Association will be held at Madison, Wisconsin, April 12 and 13, 1935.

The Sixth Annual Convention of the Western Association of Teachers of Speech was held at the University of Utah from November 29 to December 1. The general theme of the convention was "Revaluation of the Place of Speech in the Educational Process." Joseph Smith, of the University of Utah, presided at the Thursday luncheon session, at which the only address was given by Lester Raines, of New Mexico Normal University, on the subject "Learning from the Theatres of Europe." In the afternoon three original one-act plays were presented: *After the Fall*, by Dorothy Funk, University of Denver Players; *Dudes is Dumb*, by Charles Bergmann and William Strickfaden, The Koshares, New Mexico Normal University; and *Escemption*, by Conrad Wedberg, University of Redlands Dramatic Club. A reception in the president's suite at the Hotel Utah, with Maud May Babcock, of the University of Utah, as hostess, preceded the Thanksgiving Dinner, at which Herbert B. Maw, of the University of Utah, was toastmaster. The address of the evening was delivered by the Governor of Utah. The evening was concluded with a shortened version of the *Comedy of Errors*, presented by the Brigham Young University chapter of Theta Alpha Phi, under the direction of Mr. and Mrs. T. Earl Pardoe. The only address at the General Session Friday morning was given by Dr. Albert Davis, oral surgeon of San Francisco. The programs for the special sessions are given below:

GENERAL SESSION, Thursday morning

Address of Welcome, President George Thomas, University of Utah.
Response, Maynard L. Daggy, Washington State College.
"The Important Contribution that Speech Training May Make to the Education of the Teacher," F. Wesley Orr, University of Washington.
"Evaluation of Speech in Relationship to Modern Trends in Education," Dr. John R. Nuttall, Jr., Superintendent of Schools, Salt Lake City.

DRAMA SESSION, Friday morning

Klonda Lynn, Arizona State Teachers College, Flagstaff, Presiding.
"Oriental Drama," Maud May Babcock, University of Utah.

"A Comparison of Acting Techniques for *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*," Frederic Hile, University of Denver.
"Pantomime," T. Earl Pardoe, Brigham Young University.

INTERPRETATIVE READING

Elizabeth Gilliland, Occidental College, Presiding.

"The Oral Approach to Literary Appreciation," Frances Tobey, Colorado State Teachers College, Greeley.
"Appreciation as a Factor in the Field of Speech," Chester J. Myers, Utah State Agricultural College.

PUBLIC SPEAKING

Leland Chapin, Stanford University, Presiding.

"The Creative Element in Public Speaking," Carlyn R. Winger, Pacific University.
"Speech and a Wider Vision," J. Fred McGrew, Fresno State College.

CHORIC SPEECH

Ellen C. Henderson, University of Utah, Presiding.

"Rhythm and the Reading Choir," Mabel S. Reynolds, University of Colorado.
"Group Reading and Its Place in the Speech Curriculum," Elizabeth M. Jenks, San Jose State Teachers College.
Demonstration by University of Utah Student Choir, directed by Ellen C. Henderson.
"The Teaching Technique of Choir Speech," Elizabeth E. Keppie, Pasadena Junior College.

SPEECH CORRECTION

Florence Smith, Sacramento Schools, Presiding.

"Remedial Treatment for Nervous Speech Disorders in High School," Florence Smith, Sacramento Public Schools.
"Relation of the Home to the School in the Correction of Nervous Speech Disorders," Jessie Williams, Sacramento Public Schools.
"Psycho-Analysis for Speech Situations," Elwood Murray, University of Denver.
Address, Dr. Albert Davis, oral surgeon, San Francisco.

STUDENT SESSION

Bernard Hyink, University of Redlands, Presiding.

"Remarks on Oratory and Persuasive Speaking," Don Fareed, Occidental College.
"Original Plays from the Southwest," Charles Bergmann, New Mexico Normal University.
"The Value of Contests to the Student," Phyllis Norton, University of Southern California.
"Stages on Wheels," William Strickfaden, New Mexico Normal University.
Address, Clarence T. Simon, Northwestern University.

RADIO SPEECH

Wiley K. Peterson, Bakersfield Junior College, California, Presiding.

"Radio Speech," Charles B. Mitchell, Oregon State College.

"Speech and the Broadcasting Experience," Charles Frederick Lindsley, Occidental College.

SPEECH AUDITORIUM ACTIVITIES

Fern Young, Snow College, Presiding.

Papers read by June Donahue, Thatcher School, Pueblo, Colorado; and Ora M. Johnson, University High School, Los Angeles.

PHONETICS

Mary E. Webster, University of Utah, Presiding.

"Use of the I.P.A. as a Speech Aid," James L. Barker, University of Utah.

"The Place of Phonetics in the Speech Curriculum," Dean Garrett de Jong, Brigham Young University.

GENERAL SESSION, Friday afternoon

"Speech, A Basic Training in the Educational Process," W. Arthur Cable, University of Arizona.

"The Implications for the Teaching of Speech of the Re-Valuation of the Educational Process," Dwayne Orton, College of the Pacific.

HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE

Elva van Winkle, West Side High School, Salt Lake City, Presiding.

"High School Debate Problems," W. K. Peterson, Bakersfield Junior College, California.

"The Value of Debate in Attaining Social and Political Leadership," Carrie E. Church, Byers High School, Colorado.

HIGH SCHOOL DRAMATICS

Mary Wooley, Ogden High School, Utah, Presiding.

"The High School Stage," Katherine Ommanney, North High School, Denver.

"The Place of Drama in the Secondary School," Helen L. Wirt.

ORATORY AND PERSUASIVE SPEECH

Robert Clark, Pasadena College, Presiding.

"College Oratory," R. D. Mahaffey, Linfield College.

"Oratory of the Immediate Future," Leland Chapin, Stanford University.

COLLEGE DEBATE

Bates Booth, University of Southern California, Presiding.

"Experiments in New Types of Intercollegiate Debates," Ralph G. Eckert, San Jose State Teachers College.

"The Place of the Honor Society in the Debate Program," Bruno E. Jacob, University of Denver.

"The Case for and Against the Tournament," Joseph H. Baccus, University of Redlands.

"No Room for Argument—A View of the Persuasion Theory of Debate," W. E. Stevens, University of Wyoming.

SPEECH PATHOLOGY

T. Earl Pardoe, Brigham Young University, Presiding.

"Major Theories as Practiced in the United States and Some Recent Investigations in the Field of Speech," T. Earl Pardoe.

"Overlooked Factors in Intonation," James L. Barker, University of Utah.
"Speech Fluency," Mary E. Webster, University of Utah.
"Physical Defects of Nose and Throat Affecting the Speech Mechanism," Dr. L. Weston Oaks, Specialist in Throat Surgery, Brigham Young University.
Paper by Dr. L. E. Travis, University of Iowa, read by the chairman.

JUNIOR HIGH AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Anne Hartman, Portland Public Schools, Presiding.

"Teacher Vision in Preparation for Speech Work in the Elementary School," Mary E. Webster, University of Utah.
"Motivation of Classroom Projects as the Basis for Speech Work in the Auditorium," Ella Kelsey, Principal, Riverside School, Salt Lake City.
"Speech in the Junior High School," Franc Rae Jennings, Eleanor Toll School, Glendale.
"Mental Hygiene, Speech, and the Child," Edna Baxter, University of Denver.
Demonstration by pupils of the Forest School, Salt Lake City, under the direction of John Lambson.

HIGH SCHOOL

Bessie Jones, South High School, Salt Lake City, Presiding.

"The Old and New Place of Dramatics in Education," Myrintha Burningham, Davis County High School, Kaysville, Utah.
"Implementing the Social Sciences Through Speech Training," Elizabeth K. Work, Fort Morgan High School, Colorado.
"Survey of Speech in Utah High Schools," Genevieve H. Wilcox, Granite High School, Utah.

JUNIOR COLLEGE

Russell R. Johnson, Long Beach Junior College, Presiding.

"Some Aspects of the Teaching of Speech on the Junior College Level," Dr. LeRoy Cowles, Dean of the Lower Division, University of Utah.
"Speech Teaching Backwards and Forwards," J. N. Smelser, Phoenix Junior College, Arizona.

TEACHERS COLLEGE

Beryl Simpson, State Teachers College, Tempe, Arizona, Presiding.

"How Much Speech Training Should Be Required of the Public School Teacher?" Helen McGrew, Supervisor of Speech, Greeley, Colorado.
"Reading from the Printed Page." Klonda Lynn, State Teachers College, Flagstaff, Arizona.

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY

A. E. Whitehead, University of Idaho, Presiding

"The Fundamentals Course and Speech Personality." Elwood Murray, University of Denver.
A Motion Picture Showing Posture, Movement, and Gesture of Students in a Speech Fundamentals Class, Erna P. Triplett, University of Denver.

Friday evening Theta Alpha Phi presented *The First Mrs. Fraser*, by St. John Ervine, under the direction of Harry R. Allen, and Saturday afternoon, under the direction of Maud May Babcock, convention visitors were invited to watch the matinee dress rehearsal of the University of Utah Dramatic Club

Play, *The Late Christopher Bean*, by Sidney Howard. Rounds of the debate tournament were held throughout the week, with the finals on Friday, together with final contests in oratory, interpretative reading, and extempore speaking.

The annual meeting of the Missouri Association of Teachers of Speech was held in Kansas City November 8 and 9. One session was held Thursday afternoon, preceding the Association Dinner, and the final session Friday morning. Preceding the meetings a clinical demonstration of remedial work in speech was held under the direction of Louise Abney at the Kansas City Teachers College. The programs of the two sessions were as follows:

Thursday Afternoon

Bessie Gay Secrest, Southwest High School, Kansas City, Presiding.

Verse Speaking Choir, under the direction of Elizabeth Bisbee, Central Junior High School, Kansas City.

"Survey of Speech Education in Missouri," Agnes Rank, Jefferson City Junior College.

"Speech Correction and Improvement," Louise Abney, Kansas City Teachers College.

"The Work of the High School Debate Leagues," J. N. Hanthorn, Principal William Chrisman High School, Independence.

"Recent Developments in the Diagnosis of Speech Needs of High School Students," Dr. Loren Dudley Reid, Westport Senior High School, Kansas City.

"The Future of Speech Education in Missouri," W. E. Gilman, University of Missouri.

Friday Morning

"Student Participation," W. Perwitt Ewing, William Jewell College.

"Teacher Placement," R. L. Davidson, Jr., Chairman Placement Committee, University of Missouri.

"Advantages of the Convention Plan in Debates and Oral Discussion," Robert F. Young, Washington University.

Debate on the state question: "Resolved: That the federal government should adopt the policy of equalizing educational opportunity throughout the nation by means of annual grants to the several states for public elementary and secondary education." C. C. Fairchild, Kansas City, vs. L. A. Wickens, Osborne. Comment by Bower Aly, University of Missouri.

"Oratory," John Barnes, Park College.

"Creative Dramatics in the Junior High School," Angus Springer, Nevada High School.

"The Direction of Senior High School and College Dramatic Productions," Donovan Rhynsburger, University of Missouri.

A second meeting of the Missouri Association of Teachers of Speech was held at Columbia a month later, December 6, 7, and 8, in conjunction with the First Annual Meeting of the Missouri Academy of Science, which has just been organized, and which has a membership of more than four hundred teachers, physicians, engineers, industrial scientists, and others interested in science. All of the sciences, both pure and applied, are included. The first session was a

joint meeting with the Psychology Section, at which the address, "The Place of Science in Modern Liberal Education," was given by Dr. R. C. McCarthy, Professor of Experimental Psychology at St. Louis University. The program for the main Speech Section was as follows:

"The Co-ordination of Speech Activities in Education," Lawrence A. Mortensen, Stephens College.

"Sound Effects in Radiobroadcasting," Sherman P. Lawton, Stephens College.

"What Radio Can Do for Speech Education," Milford Waddell, University of Kansas City.

"The Place of Speech in the Curriculum," Dean T. W. H. Irion, School of Education, University of Missouri.

"The Speech Laboratory and the Speech Clinic," Claude E. Kantner, Stephens College.

"The Nature and Importance of Rebuttal in Debate," R. L. Davidson, University of Missouri.

"Problems of Play Production in Schools and Colleges," Donovan Rhynsburger, University of Missouri.

"Costuming *Alison's House*, by Susan Glaspell," Meriam Beuttler, Stephens College.

"Educational Dramatics vs. the Professional Theatre," Rudolph C. Bednar, Christian College.

A seminar on the high school debate question Saturday morning was followed by a High School Debate Tournament. Saturday evening was devoted to an open-forum debate between the University of Kansas and the University of Missouri on the subject of federal aid to public education.

The Mississippi teachers of speech held their convention last April, their programs consisting of talks and round table discussions on the Speech Curriculum of the Mississippi High Schools. Margaret Weisbrod, of Jackson, was elected President, Nelly Magee of Clinton Vice-President, and Evelyn Steadman of Hattiesburg Secretary-Treasurer.

The biennial meeting of the Florida Association of Teachers of Speech was held at Southern College the 27th of October. Two important announcements were made at the meeting: the State Board of Educaion will now accept one year's work in speech; and the teachers of speech in the public school system will have their speech training recognized officially upon their certificates. The officers of the Association for the current year are as follows: President, A. A. Hopkins, University of Florida; First Vice-President, Amanda Center, St. Petersburg Junior College; Second Vice-President, Margaret Combs, Miami.

Kentucky teachers of speech held their annual meeting at Louisville on October second. Their new president is J. Reid Sterrett, Jr., formerly of Center College, but now of Western Kentucky State Teachers College.

Through the co-operation of the Department of Speech of the University of Wisconsin, the Wisconsin Forensic Board, the Department of Debating and

Play, *The Late Christopher Bean*, by Sidney Howard. Rounds of the debate tournament were held throughout the week, with the finals on Friday, together with final contests in oratory, interpretative reading, and extempore speaking.

The annual meeting of the Missouri Association of Teachers of Speech was held in Kansas City November 8 and 9. One session was held Thursday afternoon, preceding the Association Dinner, and the final session Friday morning. Preceding the meetings a clinical demonstration of remedial work in speech was held under the direction of Louise Abney at the Kansas City Teachers College. The programs of the two sessions were as follows:

Thursday Afternoon

Bessie Gay Secrest, Southwest High School, Kansas City, Presiding.

Verse Speaking Choir, under the direction of Elizabeth Bisbee, Central Junior High School, Kansas City.

"Survey of Speech Education in Missouri," Agnes Rank, Jefferson City Junior College.

"Speech Correction and Improvement," Louise Abney, Kansas City Teachers College.

"The Work of the High School Debate Leagues," J. N. Hanthorn, Principal William Chrisman High School, Independence.

"Recent Developments in the Diagnosis of Speech Needs of High School Students," Dr. Loren Dudley Reid, Westport Senior High School, Kansas City.

"The Future of Speech Education in Missouri," W. E. Gilman, University of Missouri.

Friday Morning

"Student Participation," W. Perwitt Ewing, William Jewell College.

"Teacher Placement," R. L. Davidson, Jr., Chairman Placement Committee, University of Missouri.

"Advantages of the Convention Plan in Debates and Oral Discussion," Robert F. Young, Washington University.

Debate on the state question: "Resolved: That the federal government should adopt the policy of equalizing educational opportunity throughout the nation by means of annual grants to the several states for public elementary and secondary education." C. C. Fairchild, Kansas City, vs. L. A. Wickens, Osborne. Comment by Bower Aly, University of Missouri.

"Oratory," John Barnes, Park College.

"Creative Dramatics in the Junior High School," Angus Springer, Nevada High School.

"The Direction of Senior High School and College Dramatic Productions," Donovan Rhynsburger, University of Missouri.

A second meeting of the Missouri Association of Teachers of Speech was held at Columbia a month later, December 6, 7, and 8, in conjunction with the First Annual Meeting of the Missouri Academy of Science, which has just been organized, and which has a membership of more than four hundred teachers, physicians, engineers, industrial scientists, and others interested in science. All of the sciences, both pure and applied, are included. The first session was a

joint meeting with the Psychology Section, at which the address, "The Place of Science in Modern Liberal Education," was given by Dr. R. C. McCarthy, Professor of Experimental Psychology at St. Louis University. The program for the main Speech Section was as follows:

"The Co-ordination of Speech Activities in Education," Lawrence A. Mortensen, Stephens College.

"Sound Effects in Radiobroadcasting," Sherman P. Lawton, Stephens College.

"What Radio Can Do for Speech Education," Milford Waddell, University of Kansas City.

"The Place of Speech in the Curriculum," Dean T. W. H. Irion, School of Education, University of Missouri.

"The Speech Laboratory and the Speech Clinic," Claude E. Kantner, Stephens College.

"The Nature and Importance of Rebuttal in Debate," R. L. Davidson, University of Missouri.

"Problems of Play Production in Schools and Colleges," Donovan Rhynsburger, University of Missouri.

"Costuming *Alison's House*, by Susan Glaspell," Meriam Beuttler, Stephens College.

"Educational Dramatics vs. the Professional Theatre," Rudolph C. Bednar, Christian College.

A seminar on the high school debate question Saturday morning was followed by a High School Debate Tournament. Saturday evening was devoted to an open-forum debate between the University of Kansas and the University of Missouri on the subject of federal aid to public education.

The Mississippi teachers of speech held their convention last April, their programs consisting of talks and round table discussions on the Speech Curriculum of the Mississippi High Schools. Margaret Weisbrod, of Jackson, was elected President, Nelly Magee of Clinton Vice-President, and Evelyn Steadman of Hattiesburg Secretary-Treasurer.

The biennial meeting of the Florida Association of Teachers of Speech was held at Southern College the 27th of October. Two important announcements were made at the meeting: the State Board of Educaion will now accept one year's work in speech; and the teachers of speech in the public school system will have their speech training recognized officially upon their certificates. The officers of the Association for the current year are as follows: President, A. A. Hopkins, University of Florida; First Vice-President, Amanda Center, St. Petersburg Junior College; Second Vice-President, Margaret Combs, Miami.

Kentucky teachers of speech held their annual meeting at Louisville on October second. Their new president is J. Reid Sterrett, Jr., formerly of Center College, but now of Western Kentucky State Teachers College.

Through the co-operation of the Department of Speech of the University of Wisconsin, the Wisconsin Forensic Board, the Department of Debating and

Public Discussion of the University Extension Division, and the local schools concerned, a series of Speech Institutes was held during the fall in various Wisconsin towns — Wisconsin Rapids, Eau Claire, Chippewa Falls, Stevens Point, and Madison. The programs consisted of conferences and classes in debate, declamation, dramatics, extemporaneous speaking, reading, and oratory, conducted by Professors Ewbank, Borchers, Johnson, Lees, and Mitchell of the University staff of Speech. There were also demonstrations of reading contests, intercollegiate debates, and debate tournaments.

The Division of Speech at the University of Arizona has just been transferred from the Department of English in the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences, to the newly created College of Fine Arts, in which it ranks as an autonomous division. A new degree has also been created—that of Bachelor of Arts in Speech. W. Arthur Cable is head of the division.

The University of Denver reports an unusually interesting and successful program of choral speaking, using a choir of twenty girls and twenty-five boys, and presenting "The March of the Colorado Indian Tribes," a unified series of poems from the *Pageant of Colorado* by Lilian White Spencer. Introductory, transitional, and concluding speeches in verse were delivered by a narrator. Indian music by Charles S. Skilton (Victor records 22144 and 22174) was played during the speeches of the narrator, certain of the chants by the choir were accompanied by flute-music, and an Indian drum was used as a signal to begin the chants, as well as elsewhere in the recitation. In addition to the music, lights were used for heightening the effect of the poetry. When the narrator spoke, the choir was in darkness; during the chants, the choir, dressed in white against a black background and with a gauze curtain before it, was illuminated by a floodlight from each side of the stage. Various colors and intensities of light were used.

FORENSICS

The Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Debating Association of Pennsylvania Colleges was held at Harrisburg early in October. One of the purposes of this meeting is to provide an opportunity for the discussion and selection of debate topics and for the arrangement of debates with member colleges. This year there was also considerable discussion of the Intercollegiate Forum, which was used in several instances last season with marked success, and of co-operation in a state Convention Debate.

H. L. Ewbank and Robert Capel, of the University of Wisconsin, have undertaken an experiment designed to measure the effect of debating upon the attitudes of debaters, and the effectiveness of debating in conveying information and in influencing the attitudes of members of the audience. The Board of Control of the Wisconsin High School Forensic Association has urged all its member high schools to co-operate in furnishing the information necessary to conduct the investigation.

The University of North Dakota ranks well up among those colleges and universities which strongly emphasize forensic activities. During the past year

their debating squad of thirteen men participated in 58 debates, only ten of which were decision debates. One of the most interesting undertakings of this type, carried out jointly with the North Dakota Agricultural College at Fargo, was a "Good Will Tour." Two cars were sent out around the state, each carrying two teams of two students each, and a speaker, to present programs in communities some distance from Fargo and Grand Forks. This tour covered only three days—a long week-end in April—but eleven communities were visited, where programs were presented to audiences which numbered all the way from 75 to 700. Transportation expenses were paid by the two institutions concerned, and the individual communities provided lodging and meals and local expenses. The question for debate in each case was: "Resolved: That the powers of the President should be substantially increased as a settled policy." The orator who accompanied one group spoke on "The Educational Crisis," and the one who accompanied the second group on "The Missouri River Diversion Project."

DRAMATICS

Major productions during the fall at various Southern colleges, as listed in the News Letter of the Southern Association of Teachers of Speech, were as follows: Berea College, *Macbeth*, with Dr. Raine playing the title role; at Louisiana State University, *Fashion*, *Children of the Moon*, and *The Tempest*, all directed by C. L. Shaver, and *Death Takes a Holiday*, directed by Mrs. E. C. Flower; at Duke University, *Hotel Universe*, with A. T. West as director; at John B. Stetson University, under the direction of I. C. Stover, *Lady Windermere's Fan* and *Smilin' Through*, with *Holiday*, *The Wild Duck*, *So This Is London*, *The Return of Peter Grimm*, and a Shakespearian play scheduled for the spring; at Southern College, in charge of Marguerite Wills, *Moonshine and Honeysuckle*, *Outward Bound*, and *The Doctor in Spite of Himself*; at Western Kentucky State Teachers College, *Miss Lula Bett*, directed by J. Reid Sterrett, Jr.; at Newport News High School, under the direction of Dorothy Crane, *The Late Christopher Bean*, *The Enchanted Cottage*, *Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Little Women*, and *The Torchbearers*; at Talladega College, directed by Lillian Vorhees, *A Marriage Proposal*, *The Bishop's Candlesticks*, *The Mayor and the Manicure*; and a program at the University of Florida consisting of *A Night at an Inn*, *Death Says It Isn't So*, and *Action*, directed by H. P. Constans.

An unusual Play Service has been established at Washington University at St. Louis, which offers to high schools, colleges, churches, and other amateur dramatic groups the opportunity to produce at minimum expense plays written especially for their audiences. Ten one-act plays are listed in the first bulletin, all but one of them written by students in W. G. B. Carson's course in the Technique of the Drama, and all selected by a committee from manuscripts submitted in prize play competitions during the past ten years. The group producing the plays pays a flat fee of $3.00 to Washington University, which is considered adequate to cover the expenses involved, and which provides enough copies for actors and director. Manuscripts must be returned after the performances, but there is no limit to the number of performances of a given play permissible without additional fees. A descriptive bulletin, containing

synopses of the ten plays now available and directions for using the Play Service, may be secured directly from Play Service, Box 94, Washington University.

The eleventh annual One-Act Festival presented by the dramatic classes of the Pontiac High School, Michigan, was held December 5, 6, and 7, under the direction of W. N. Viola. The plays presented differed each evening, and included the following: *Ile*, by Eugene O'Neill; *The Rector*, by Rachel Crothers; *Mrs. Oakley's Telephone*, by E. M. Jennings; *Switch on the Moonlight*, by Walter L. Bissell; *Bimbo the Pirate*, by Booth Tarkington; *The Decimal Point*, by Anna Best Joder; *The Lonely Hearth*, by Savage and Peltret; *Sauce for the Goslings*, by Elgine Warren; *The Monkey's Paw*, by W. W. Jacobs and Louis N. Parker; *A Pair of Lunatics*, by W. R. Walkes; *At the Stroke of Twelve*, by Aaron E. Bishop; and *Unto the Least of These*, a miracle play by Adelaide C. Rowell.

The Mountebanks Theatre of Union College, New York, opened its twenty-third season November 23 and 24 with a revival of *A Bold Stroke for a Wife*, by Mrs. Centlivre. This play was first produced in 1717, and was revived in 1804 at Union College as the first play to be presented on the campus.

An innovation at Leland Powers School of the Theatre, Boston, this past summer, was the opening of a summer theatre in the little Town Hall of Marshfield Hills, with Haven Powers and Clayton Priestnal in charge, and Arthur Holman, of New York, as director of plays. Representative plays by contemporary American and European dramatists were produced for six weeks.

PERSONAL

Members of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH will learn with regret of the sudden death of Dr. Daniel W. Redmond, for more than thirty years a member of the staff of the College of the City of New York, early in November. Dr. Redmond was in charge of the Speech Department of the College, and for the last few years he had also been Dean of the College. He was one of the original group which founded the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION.

Dr. T. C. Trueblood, Professor-Emeritus of Public Speaking of the University of Michigan, sailed recently from New York on a trip through the Panama Canal to Los Angeles. He expects to visit Colombia, Panama, San Salvador, Guatemala and Mexico en route, and will return to Ann Arbor early in April to get his University golf team under way. He is coach of the team.

Howard Higgins, of Miami University, is spending the present year on leave at Boston University, where he is working upon his doctorate in psychology. He is also doing part-time teaching in psychology and education at Emerson College of Oratory. He has recently had an encounter with the law which should be of interest to speech teachers who transport their students upon speech activities. While on a debate trip in January, 1932, an accident occurred in Illinois, which has a guest statute which relieves the owner of a car for liability for damages to non-paying guests. One of the students, one Isador Casper, filed suit for $15,000 damages. The court ruled that since Professor Higgins transacted some personal business in Chicago, and since the University debate fund paid the hotel bills, the trip was therefore to the mutual advantage of the University and himself and that payment of the hotel bills

by the University constituted compensation for the trip, in spite of the fact that he had provided his own gas and oil and received no compensation whatever for the use of his car. This ruling took him out from under the provisions of the guest statute, and made him liable for damages to those in his car if he were responsible for the accident, at the same time relieving his insurance company of financial responsibility in any damage awards which might be made. Fortunately, the jury was convinced that the other car involved was wholly responsible for the accident. But teachers should know that they may become personally liable for any damages incurred while they are on official business, provided that they transact any personal business whatever, visit friends, or do sight-seeing, so that it may be argued that the trip was of mutual advantage to teacher and institution.

Martin F. Palmer has been elected head of the newly created department of Speech Sciences and director of the Flo Brown Memorial Laboratory for Research in the Speech Sciences, which has just been perpetually endowed, at the Municipal University of Wichita.

Robert Masters, assistant director of the Indiana University Theater, has resigned to accept the headship of the Department of Speech at the Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute. Virgil Smith, a graduate of the University of Iowa, is taking his place at Indiana University.

Susan Jane Dikeman has resigned her position at Indiana University to take charge of the speech work in the high school at Monmouth, Illinois. Her work at Indiana is being taken by Catherine Feltus.

Dr. Lee Norvelle spent the month of August at the Universal Studios, watching the filming of Dickens' *Great Expectations.*

Maynard Griffith, who spent last year working toward his doctorate in speech at the University of Iowa, is taking Professor Higgins' work at Miami University this year, while the latter is studying at Boston University.

Frances K. Gooch, of Agnes Scott College, spent the summer in England, where she attended drama Lectures at Cambridge, the Drama Festival at Malvern, and plays in London. Before returning, she enjoyed a cruise on the North Sea.

Lillian Vorhees, of Talladega College, spent the summer at Columbia University, where she made a special study of the speech needs of the Negro college student.

Josh Lee, formerly professor of public speaking at the University of Oklahoma, was elected to the National House of Representatives in the November landslide.

Ross Taylor is the new dramatic director and speech teacher at Center College, Kentucky. He is a graduate of the University of Oklahoma.

C. M. Wise, head of the Speech Department at Louisiana State University, spent the summer in Providence, Rhode Island, at Brown University, which is the headquarters of the Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada. He was awarded a fellowship in linguistic research by the General Education Board for that purpose. This year he is offering at Louisiana State University the first course in Dialect Geography.

Herbert Koepp-Baker, of Pennsylvania State College, is on leave of absence this year, studying for his doctorate under Dr. Lee Travis at the University of Iowa.

Alethea Smith is teaching at the University of Arizona, taking the place of Mrs. Eloise Sterling Hirt. Miss Smith was formerly at the Florida State College for Women.

This department has not previously chronicled the death, on May 30th of last year, of Professor Irvah L. Winter, for twenty-six years in charge of the work in Public Speaking at Harvard University. He had been Professor-Emeritus since 1925.

Professor Dayton D. McKean of Princeton was re-elected to the New Jersey Assembly at the November election.

Professor Hoyt H. Hudson has completed his year's work as Research Associate at the Huntington Library and has Returned to Princeton for the second semester of the present academic year. This summer Mr. Hudson will give a teachers' course in speech and an advanced course in public speaking and persuasion in the first summer session of the University of Colorado at Boulder.

Word has been received of the death, on January 7, of Milton H. Badger, Instructor in Public Speaking at the University of Colorado and Secretary of the Colorado State Debating League.

CONVENTION REPORT

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH
Nineteenth Annual Convention
New Orleans, December 27–29, 1934

MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, DECEMBER 26

Meeting called to order by President Ewbank. Densmore, Executive Secretary, submitted the financial report* for the year ended December 19, 1934. Motion made and carried that the report be adopted. Densmore also submitted a statistical and historical abstract* from the records of the ASSOCIATION for the twenty-year period 1915–34. Motion made and carried that this be accepted Densmore submitted six recommendations: (1) that hereafter the nominating committee be furnished with a list of the officers of the ASSOCIATION so tabulated as to show geographical distribution by states, together with figures showing distribution of membership by states, in order that the distribution of offices may be commensurate with the distribution of memberships (such a comparative list for 1934 was included with the recommendation; (2) that since the slate of nominees for office published in the June, 1934, QUARTERLY JOURNAL, contained the names of two nominees who were not members of the ASSOCIATION, means should be provided so that in the future only members be nominated; (3) that the nominating committee should nominate two or more candidates for each office and these nominees, with any candidates nominated by petition, should be voted upon by the entire membership of the ASSOCIATION, by mail; (4) that the Executive Secretary should be empowered to remove the name of any member after he has received one issue of the JOURNAL published after the expiration of his membership; (5) that the Executive Secretary should be empowered to refuse sale of advertising space to any client allowing his account to remain in arrears for ninety days; (6) that the division of "Personals" in the department of "News and Notes" in the JOURNAL be increased to at least three pages.

Motion made and carried that recommendations 1, 4, and 5 be accepted as submitted. Motion made and carried that recommendations 2 and 3 be referred to a committee composed of Weaver, chairman, Wise, Simon, and Densmore, to report* to the Council at this Convention. Motion made and carried that the Executive Council suggest to the editor of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL that whenever possible the number of pages devoted to "News and Notes" be increased.

The matter of devising junior and senior classes of memberships in the ASSOCIATION was presented and referred to Weaver's committee for considera-

* Reports marked with an asterisk will be found, in whole, in part, or in summary, in the Appendix, below.

tion. Miss Gladys Borchers, chairman, Committee on Speech Education in Secondary Schools, submitted the report* of that Committee. Motion made and carried that the report be accepted, the committee be continued, and funds be granted as specified in the report. Wise read the annual report* of Hudson, editor of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH. Motion made and carried that the report be accepted. President Ewbank read messages from Professor H. S. Woodward, Thomas C. Trueblood, and Charles Swain Thomas, President of the National Council of Teachers of English.*

Simon, editor of Research Studies, reported. Motion made and carried that his report be accepted and that he be instructed to publish another issue of *Speech Monographs*. O'Neill, chairman, Committee on Relations with the National Council of Teachers of English, reported. Motion made and carried that report be accepted and the committee be continued. President Ewbank read the report of White, chairman, Committee on Intercollegiate Debating. Motion made and carried that the report be accepted and that the committee be thanked for completing its work. Brigance, chairman, Committee on Joint Research in the History of American Oratory, presented the report* of that committee. Motion made and carried that the report be accepted and committee continued.

Motion made and carried that the Committee on Speech Education in Teachers Colleges and Normal Schools be discontinued. Motion made and carried that the incoming president may appoint a similar committee if he so desires. Motion made and carried that the chairmen of the Committee on Speech Education in Elementary Schools, Committee on Speech Education in Secondary Schools, and Committee on Speech Education in Teachers Colleges and Normal Schools, should meet as a council at the next convention, with Miss Borchers acting as chairman, to consider the possibility of co-ordinating their aims and activities. Motion made and carried that the Committee on Speech Education in Junior Colleges be continued. Motion made and carried that the matter of establishing radio awards be referred to a committee consisting of the retiring and incoming presidents and a third member to be chosen by them.

In accordance with the Constitution, which requires that the editor of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH be elected one year in advance of his term of office, the Council proceeded with the election of an editor. Brigance, Crocker, Wichlens, and Wise were nominated. After considerable balloting, the Council cast a unanimous ballot for Wise.

President Ewbank appointed Weaver as a committee of one to write into the Constitution all changes voted since its adoption. Motion made and carried that the president appoint a committee on relations, to effect all possible co-operation between the National Educational Association and the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH. Meeting adjourned.

GENERAL SESSION, December 27

Meeting called to order by President Ewbank. After an address of welcome by Superintendent Nicholas Baur, the President's address, and an address upon "Our National Theater" by John Dolman, Jr., the Convention proceeded to the election of officers. The President announced that P. H. Scott of Wayne

University had withdrawn his name from the list of nominees. The following officers were elected:

President, Arleigh B. Williamson
First Vice-President, C. M. Wise[1]
Second Vice-President, Enid Miller
Members of the Council, (1) H. P. Constans, (2) John Dolman, Jr., (3) R. K. Immel, (4) Robert West.

The Convention then elected a nominating committee, as follows: (1) C. M. Wise (chairman), (2) A. Craig Baird, (3) H. P. Constans, (4) Lionel Crocker, (5) H. L. Ewbank.

President Ewbank reported actions of the Executive Council. Editor Hudson's report was read. Meeting adjourned.

GENERAL SESSION, December 29

Meeting called to order by the President. After addresses by V. A. Ketcham and Harold F. Harding, the chairman of the Committee on Relations with the National Council of Teachers of English, J. M. O'Neill, made report. The Auditing Committee made report.* Motion made and carried that the report be accepted. Weaver reported and moved amendments* to the By-Laws, as drawn up by the special committee appointed by the Council. These amendments were unanimously adopted. Wise, Editor-Elect of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL, tendered his resignation as First Vice-President, and W. N. Brigance was elected to this office. Densmore, Executive Secretary, made report. Upon the suggestion of President Ewbank, the Convention gave a rising vote of thanks to Mrs. Loraine B. Welch for her services throughout the year and at the Convention in New Orleans. A resolution presented by Bower Aly was unanimously adopted that it be the consensus of the Convention assembled that the 1936 Convention be held in Kansas City. Meeting adjourned.

MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, December 29

Meeting called to order by President Ewbank. Hayworth, chairman, made report for the Committee for the Promotion of Co-operative Research. Motion made and carried that report be accepted and committee continued. Irene Poole Davis, chairman, reported for Committee on Speech Education in Elementary Schools. Motion made and carried that report be accepted and committee continued. Franklin H. Knower reported having made a compilation of dissertations written for degrees in the field of speech. Motion made and carried that the compilation be published, and publication thereof be referred to a committee composed of Wise, Simon, and Densmore. Invitation to hold the 1935 convention at Memphis was presented. Invitation to hold the 1935 convention at Detroit was presented. Bower Aly presented a resolution which called for holding the 1936 convention in Kansas City, at the invitation of the Missouri Association of Teachers of Speech. Resolution seconded. Motion made and carried to lay the question on the table until the Council should meet in 1935.

[1] Wise resigned on Saturday, December 29, and W. N. Brigance was elected in his place, as recorded in the minutes below.

Motion made and carried to thank the Missouri Association for its invitation. Moton made and carried to thank Memphis and Detroit for their invitations. Motion made and carried that the dates of the 1935 convention at Chicago be Monday, December 30, Tuesday, December 31, and Wednesday, January 1.

President Ewbank presented a communication* from Lee Emerson Bassett. President Ewbank presented a communication* from Smiley Blanton. Upon the President's suggestion, Miss Jessie Tharp and Ben Hanley members of the Committee on Hospitality, were brought before the Council and given a rising vote of appreciation for their services. Appreciation was expressed of the services of Mrs. Rupert Cortright and Darrel Mase at the registration desk. Meeting adjourned.

APPENDIX: REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Financial Report of the Executive Secretary[1]

Balance Sheet, as of December 13, 1934

Cash on hand	$1,556.08	
Accounts receivable (less doubtful accounts)	534.16	
Inventories of stock at cost	2,818.84	
Inventories of supplies	208.25	
Total Current Assets		$5,117.33
Fixed Assets (office equipment) less depreciation		435.51
Total Assets		$5,552.84

Liabilities and Net Worth

Liabilities: none		
Net Worth: Surplus, December 19, 1933	$4,238.27	
Profit for Current Year	1,314.57	
		$5,552.84

Income Sheet, for the year ended December 13, 1934

Income from Publications:		
Memberships (regular)	$4,919.85	
Bulletins	192.30	
Monographs	293.05	
Journals (single copies)	492.07	
Advertising	1,442.17	
Total		$7,339.44

[1] The report is here summarized. Copies of the complete report may be obtained from the Executive Secretary.

Cost of Sales:		
Inventory, December 19, 1933	$2,392.90	
Purchases, Journals	2,752.85	
Monographs	544.10	
	$5,689.85	
Less: Inventory, December 13, 1934	2,818.84	
Total cost of publications sold		2,871.01
Gross Profit on Publications		$4,468.43
Expenses:		
Journal distribution	$ 522.14	
Sales promotion	1,454.53	
Collection expense and bad accounts	847.67	
Office expense (including secretarial)	1,573.07	
Total expenses		4,397.41
Net Profit on Publications		$ 71.02
Other Income:		
Sustaining memberships	$ 517.50	
Eastern Public Speaking Conference	250.00	
Directories and placement service	454.00	
Convention registrations (1933)	795.50	
Less: convention and officers' expenses	773.45	
Net other income		$1,243.55
Total net profit		$1,314.57

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT, 1915–34, BY THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY[1]

This statistical abstract consisted of graphs and tables. From these the following facts are taken. The number of pages published by the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION (in the QUARTERLY JOURNAL plus, from 1928 on, *Speech Bulletins* and *Speech Monographs*: 1915, 324; 1916, 423; 1917, 368; 1918, 467; 1919, 412; 1925, 437; 1926, 490; 1927, 509; 1928, 628; 1929, 644; 1930, 655; 1931, 742; 1932, 725; 1933, 558; 1934, 737. The QUARTERLY JOURNAL, considered alone, reached a peak of 628 pages in 1928, fell to 612 in 1929 and 564 in 1930, then rose to 610 in 1931 and 660 in 1932; in 1933 the number of pages fell to 558 and in 1934 it was 608.

As to advertising, there has been a fairly steady rise since 1919, with a notable increase from 19 pages in 1924 to 84 pages in 1932. The number of pages fell to 78 in 1933, but rocketed to 113 in 1934. These figures apply to the

[1] The abstract contains a great many other interesting facts besides those summarized here. Copies may be obtained from the Executive Secretary.

JOURNAL only; the *Bulletins* and *Monographs* also carried advertising, and brought the total number of pages for 1934 to 135.

In convention attendance, there was a very slow growth from the original 56 of 1915 to the 125 at Cincinnati in 1923; other figures follow: Evanston, 1924, 215; New York, 1925, 170; Chicago, 1926, 315; Cincinnati, 1927, 215; Chicago, 1928, 350; New York, 1929, 400; Chicago, 1930, 515; Detroit, 1931, 425; Los Angeles, 1932, 380; New York, 1933, 440.

In membership, the graph shows a steady rise, broken slightly in 1921 and again, with a greater drop, in 1933. Figures are as follows: 1915, 160; 1916, 210; 1917, 287; 1918, 390; 1919, 482; 1920, 700; 1921, 635; 1922, 880; 1923, 863; 1924, 910; 1925, 1100; 1926, 1130; 1927, 1240; 1928, 1300; 1929, 1290; 1930, 1520; 1931, 1600; 1932, 1959; 1933, 1639; 1934, 2161.

COMMITTEE FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SPEECH EDUCATION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS[1]

Aims of the Committee: I. To obtain a complete picture of the amount and nature of speech training in the secondary schools of the United States. II. To improve and extend speech training in the secondary schools.

Progress of the Committee: (Toward the first aim) Organization of a group of associate members—one in each state. Each associate member is compiling and keeping up to date a list of all speech teachers in his state. Alabama, Florence Pass, 2925 Ridgeway Avenue, Birmingham; Arizona, Lillian Savage, Box 1122, Prescott; California, Mrs. Mabel Gifford, 305 Stanford Court, San Francisco; Colorado, Helen Grew, City Schools, Greeley; Delaware, M. Channing Wagner, Public Schools, Wilmington; Florida, Edna Mae Swartsel, Tarpon Springs; Idaho, Thelma Melgard, 317 N. Hayes Street, Moscow; Illinois, Dorothy Smith, York Community High School Elmhurst; Indiana, Esther Pierson, Public Schools, Gary; Iowa, Earl S. Kalp, North High School, Des Moines; Kansas, J. Henry Hedley, Senior High School, Dodge City; Kentucky, Jack Sterrett, State Teachers College, Bowling Greeen; Louisiana, Evelyn Kent, University of Louisiana, Baton Rouge; Michigan, Arthur Secord, Public Schools, Paw Paw; Minnesota, Myrtle Bacon, Technical High School, St. Cloud; Mississippi, Evelyn Stedman, Newton; Montana, Olive Sholz, Billings High School, Billings; Nebraska, Alma T. Lundman, York College, York; New Jersey, Ruth Thomas, 311 Mt. Prospect St., Newark; New Mexico, Harriet Davis, Las Vegas; New York, Emmie Hyans, Brooklyn Girls' Commercial High School, Brooklyn; North Dakota, Florence Sharpe, Portland; Ohio, Florence Hendee, 1215 West Fifth Avenue Columbus; Oklahoma, Mary Coatees, High School, Yukon; Oregon, Earl Wells, State Agricultural College, Corvallis; Pennsylvania, Jean Liedman, 115 Ivory Avenue, N.S., Pittsburgh; Rhode Island, Edith Hutton, 269 West Forest Avenue, Pawtucket; South Dakota, Lois Buswell, High School, Highmore; Tennessee, Elsa Schilling, Humes High School, Memphis; Texas, Wilda Henderson, Central High School, Sherman; Utah, Mrs. Lowell Lees, Salt Lake City, now at University of Wisconsin; Washington, W. H. Veatch, Washington State College, Pull-

[1] Some portions of this report are here omitted. Copies of the complete report may be obtained by writing to Miss Gladys Borchers, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

man; West Virginia, Allen O. Ransom, 323 South Indiana Avenue, Huntington; Wisconsin, Fred Baxter, West Bend; Wyoming, Jeanette Johnson, Sheridan.

In pursuance of the second aim: The Oral English section of the curriculum being prepared by the National Council of Teachers of English has been worked out by this committee. Work on the course of study for the fundamental course in high school has been continued. Reports from 38 states show:

a. Courses of study of the following states are available for loans by writing to this Committee: Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Louisiana.

b. Oral English is provided for in the English course of study in 12 states: Maine, Kansas, Montana, Illinois, Michigan, Wyoming, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, Minnesota, Indiana, West Virginia.

c. Courses of study of Maryland and Virginia are out of print; the course of study of New York is in preparation.

d. No provision is made for speech work in 12 states: North Caorlina, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Wisconsin, Colorado, Nebraska, Alabama, Maine, Pennsylvania, South Carolina.

e. Five states sell their courses of study for a fee: Florida ($1.18), South Dakota ($2.95), Idaho ($ .40), Utah, Iowa.

The Committee has selected articles and other material for publication in the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, *Journal of Educational Research, N.E.A. Journal, Alabama Journal* (regular column), *English Journal.*

As to college entrance requirements, in the state of Wisconsin it is now possible to present up to nine units of speech and receive entrance credit.

The committee asks the support of the National Association in the continuation of the foregoing projects, and financial aid for postage, for the purchase of courses of study, and for stenographic help in the preparation of a high school Curriculum.

Respectfully submitted,

Ralph Dennis, General Adviser, Sara M. Barber, J. Richard Bietry, Gus Campbell, Wilhelmina G. Hedde, Rose Johnson, Clara Krefting, Merle McGinnis, Stella A. Price, J. Walter Reeves, Mrs. S. F. Barrett, Paul J. Ritter, Gladys L. Barcher, Chairman.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHARLES SWAIN THOMAS

To the National Association of Teachers of Speech:

As President of the National Council of Teachers of English, I take special pleasure in sending to the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH this friendly greeting to your organization now assembled in New Orleans. Our group clearly recognizes the fact that much of our work lies within the same sector as yours; and here, in the manoeuvering of our forces, we gladly welcome your guidance and your technical skill.

We want all of your members to realize our desire for a continuously close relationship with you and your work. We shall always welcome from you

specific suggestions for making the oral expression of our young people approach more clearly the high ideals which your leaders have created.

Very Sincerely yours
Charles Swain Thomas
President of the National Council of Teachers of English

REPORT OF EDITOR OF THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL

[The first part of this report included some of the material given in the first editorial in the present issue. Some other portions are printed below.]

. . . I have never made an *a priori* survey, when accepting manuscripts, of the distribution of space to contributors geographically considered. Now it seems hardly worth while making one *a posteriori*. But I am willing to wager that the geographical distribution is according to the best principles of proportional representation—simply because material has been coming in from all sections of the country. I suppose the South has had the shortest rations; but there has been no discrimination against Southern writers.

The editor works, so far as my experience goes, with absolutely no guidance as to whether or not he is giving his customers what they want—except such as he gets from the annual meetings of the Executive Council. I may say that in two years of editing I received three or four compliments upon the make-up of the table of contents printed upon the front cover—an idea which I owed to Associate Editor Howes; I received two corrections, which I promptly printed in the Forum, upon a published article; I received no comment whatever upon any department, until about a month ago when a correspondent said that she especially liked the department "Contemporary Speeches." And aside from the corrections mentioned, I think I have had two, or possibly three, comments upon articles I have printed. To some extent, this lack of criticism has been my own fault. Had I assigned the task to them, the Advisory editors, I am sure, would have given me specific and thoroughgoing critiques. And from the Advisory Editors I have had, from time to time, valuable comments as to general and special matters of policy.

There has been an increase in the number of articles of good quality submitted. And because I was perhaps too lenient in the early part of my editorship, and yet wanted to keep my hands upon the good things that came in later, I must report an overstock at present. Yet the situation is not hopeless; and if the next editor will simply adopt the policy of returning almost everything for the next six months, a policy which I could not possibly maintain (and he can't either), the situation will be straightened out.

Another way appeals to me more; it is to maintain a slightly enlarged JOURNAL. In general, as I pointed out last year, I have been held down to space-limits considerably below those of the two preceding editors. In addition to this shrinkage, under the policy adopted a year ago I was forced to give more space than ever has been given before to articles addressed to the elementary and secondary levels. (Incidentally, I have not obeyed the motion of last year literally, in that the articles specially addressed to high school teachers have not reach the assigned figure of twenty pages an issue. I fell below once because all space was drastically cut down, and at other times because there were not enough good high school articles available. I think the

exact figure should not be prescribed.) This policy of giving space, and fairly generous space, in every issue, to work at the elementary and secondary levels I wish heartily to endorse. It should be continued, with associate editors specially appointed to the task of gathering articles. The presence of elementary and high school articles does not hurt the more general or more learned articles at all. And although last year I was in favor of separate publications for the school levels, as soon as we could afford such an arrangement, I am not so sure of that now. Only recently at a meeting of the Southern California Speech Arts Association, I received considerable enlightenment upon this matter. I find that the teachers there represented—high school and junior college—unanimously liked the general all-level publication. The junior college people especially like it, because their own work cuts across two divisions, and the junior high school people are in a similar position.

It seems to me that the proper course to take is to continue the policy of including all levels, but with it to enlarge the JOURNAL, so that an editor will have at least 180 pages (or the equivalent of 180 of our present pages) at his disposal each time. My largest issue was 162 pages, and the others ran considerably lower, down to 112 pages. As a working basis, I believe that issues of 180–190 pages would really take care of the good articles being written, and would give space enough to serve all levels. The cost, over and above present costs, should not be prohibitive.

One or two other observations should be made. I should like to call attention to the several bibliographies published in the past two years and suggest that others be published in the future. I recommend to my successor the present system of distribution of work among Associate Editors and the maintenance of four Advisory Editors chosen sectionally. The only change I would make in the set-up would be the one suggested above—altering the board of Associate Editors slightly so that there would be one person responsible for elementary school material and another responsible for secondary school material. My thanks are due, in greater measure than I can say, to the staff that has worked with me for the past two years. I cannot distinguish among them by way of special citation, because all have served faithfully and have done promptly everything asked of them. Mrs. Irene Poole and Miss Gladys Borchers, though not members of the board of Editors, have been notably helpful during the past year in gathering contributions in their respective fields of interest. To all contributors and correspondents I must issue a blanket expression of appreciation for their patience and forbearance in the face of my occasional failure to reply promptly to letters or report promptly upon articles submitted.

I heartily regret that I must close this report with a request to be relieved of the active work of editorship. I already have sent in copy for the February, 1935, issue and will read proof on this, see it through the press, and make the annual index as usual. I request, however, that the editor elected at this Convention stand ready to take over the active work of editing, beginning with the April issue. . . . I have appreciated the opportunity you have given to me to work upon this very interesting and important publication.

Respectfully submitted,

Hoyt H. Hudson

Committee on Research in Oratory[1]

The final membership of the Committee, as appointed by President H. L. Ewbank, is as follows: H. A. Wichelns, Cornell; W. H. Yeager, George Washington; A. Craig Baird, Iowa; G. W. Gray, Louisiana State; Louis Eich, Michigan; C. C. Cunningham, Northwestern; G. P. Tanquary, Southern California; F. M. Rarig, Minnesota; H. L. Ewbank, Wisconsin; W. N. Brigance, Wabash, Chairman.

The Committee is commissioned with the definite purpose of preparing and publishing a volume of studies on the *literary criticism of American orators*, something to become in a broad way to the field of speech what the *Cambridge History of American Literature* is to the field of English.

The Committee has secured from a select group of historians an opinion as to which orators have had most influence upon the course of American history. In addition to the list so obtained, much valuable information and advice was received from these historians.

The tentative plan calls for the selection of from twenty to twenty-five qualified contributors, each contributor to be responsible for the work upon one or more of the orators to be covered.

Amendments to By-Laws[2]

Article IV

Only members in good standing shall be eligible for nomination to office in the Association. The nominating committee shall submit its nominations to the Executive Secretary for certification as to the membership of nominees, before publication in the Journal. Nominations by petition also shall be subject to this certification procedure.

Article V

Whenever there are more nominations than one for any office, the Executive Secretary shall arrange for a mail ballot, open to all individual members; all votes shall be returnable to the Executive Secretary, postmarked on or before December 10.

Article VI

The Executive Council shall have the power to fill vacancies in the announced list of nominees and among officers.

Auditing Committee

We have examined in some detail the books of the Executive Secretary, Mr. G. E. Densmore. We find that the financial report checks with the bank books. We find that all accounts have been kept with admirable attention to detail and with fine regard to the itemizing of receipts and expenditures.

We commend highly the business acumen of the Executive Secretary and

[1] The report here summarized, consisting of nine mimeographed pages, may be obtained in full from Professor W. N. Brigance, Wabash College.

[2] The origin of these amendments and the passing of them by the Convention are recorded in the preceding report.

his efforts in behalf of the Association. We also wish to mention, with appreciation, the admirable work of Mrs. Lorene B. Welch, Secretary to Mr. Densmore.

Respectfully submitted,

DARREL J. MASE
LEROY LEWIS
RAY K. IMMEL, Chairman

COMMUNICATION FROM LEE EMERSON BASSETT

[Professor Bassett wrote from Hawaii, in response to a request from President Ewbank, giving an account of the status of English speech and its teaching in the Hawaiian Islands. Extracts follow.]

The most urgent and important problem in the Islands, then, is speech. Whatever the merits of other languages, English should be the major tongue here in this "integral part of the United States," this Territory of Hawaii . . . Yet it is safe to say that at least sixty per cent of all children entering the public schools neither understand nor speak English. To them it is a foreign language. The languages spoken in their homes, besides "pidgin," are chiefly Japanese and Chinese. . . .

In applying the theory that oral reading after the third and fourth grade slows up silent reading and retards the pupil in the learning process, the real and most vital need of the children of these Islands is not met. Nor, incidentally, am I yet convinced that this is not true as well in the shools of the Mainland. Few of these children will ever have occasion to write much or to read with speed, but all of them will have constant need of the spoken language and without the ability to speak English well will be seriously handicapped. . . . English in these Islands should be taught as a foreign language and by the direct method of *speech*. . . .

The question is, What is to be done about it? The University has asked me to come here and help answer it. The Board of Education in the Territory is also actively interested.

A beginning can be made with the teachers in training. I have one class of forty, made up of many races, alert, intelligent, receptive. Another class meeting late in the afternoon consists of twenty-five teachers and school principals, the majority are principals, who come from schools in Honolulu and villages within a radius of thirty miles. These people agree that the old order is not suited to conditions here and that speech training is the practical and sensible way to deal with the problem. The influence of the work of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH is evident even here, two thousand miles from the Mainland.

But what is to be done with the twenty-three hundred and more teachers in active service? . . . The immediate task seems to be to inform the teachers and the people in general of the need of speech training in the schools right through from the first grade to the University and to convince them, if possible, of the fact that the mastery of the English language, and especially spoken English, is the most urgent need in the schools of these Islands. . . . In closing may I say that one interested in speech education cannot study the situation here without realizing more than ever the vital significance of speech in all aspects and phases of man's life and development.